arXiv:1604.02199v2 [math.OC] 16 Jul 2016

Distributionally Robust Stochastic Optimization with Wasserstein Distance

Rui Gao, Anton J. Kleywegt
School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332-0205
rgao32@gatech.edu, anton@isye.gatech.edu

Distributionally robust stochastic optimization (DRSO) is an approach to optimization under uncertainty in which, instead of assuming that there is an underlying probability distribution that is known exactly, one hedges against a chosen set of distributions. In this paper we first point out that the set of distributions should be chosen to be appropriate for the application at hand, and that some of the choices that have been popular until recently are, for many applications, not good choices. We consider sets of distributions that are within a chosen Wasserstein distance from a nominal distribution, for example an empirical distribution resulting from available data. The paper argues that such a choice of sets has two advantages: (1) The resulting distributions hedged against are more reasonable than those resulting from other popular choices of sets. (2) The problem of determining the worst-case expectation over the resulting set of distributions has desirable tractability properties. We derive a dual reformulation of the corresponding DRSO problem and construct approximate worst-case distributions (or an exact worst-case distribution if it exists) explicitly via the first-order optimality conditions of the dual problem. Our contributions are five-fold. (i) We identify necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a worst-case distribution, which are naturally related to the growth rate of the objective function. (ii) We show that the worst-case distributions resulting from an appropriate Wasserstein distance have a concise structure and a clear interpretation. (iii) Using this structure, we show that data-driven DRSO problems can be approximated to any accuracy by robust optimization problems, and thereby many DRSO problems become tractable by using tools from robust optimization. (iv) To the best of our knowledge, our proof of strong duality is the first constructive proof for DRSO problems, and we show that the constructive proof technique is also useful in other contexts. (v) Our strong duality result holds in a very general setting, and we show that it can be applied to infinite dimensional process control problems and worst-case value-at-risk analysis.

Key words: distributionally robust optimization; data-driven; ambiguity set; worst-case distribution
MSC2000 subject classification: Primary: 90C15; secondary: 90C46
OR/MS subject classification: Primary: programming: stochastic

---

1. Introduction In decision making problems under uncertainty, a decision maker wants to choose a decision x from a feasible region X. The objective function $\Psi : X \times \Xi \to \mathbb{R}$ also depends on a quantity $\xi \in \Xi$ whose value is not known to the decision maker at the time the decision has to be made. In some settings it is reasonable to assume that ξ is a random element with distribution μ supported on Ξ, for example, if multiple realizations of ξ will be encountered. In such settings, the decision making problems can be formulated as *stochastic optimization* problems as follows:

$$\inf_{x \in X} \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[\Psi(x, \xi)].$$

We refer to Shapiro et al. [47] for a thorough study of stochastic optimization. One major criticism of the formulation above for practical application is the requirement that the underlying distribution μ be known to the decision maker. Even if multiple realizations of ξ are observed, μ still may not be known exactly, while use of a distribution different from μ may sometimes result in bad decisions. Another major criticism is that in many applications there are not multiple realizations of ξ that will be encountered, for example in problems involving events that may either happen once or not happen at all, and thus the notion of a true underlying distribution does not apply. These criticisms motivate the notion of *distributionally robust stochastic optimization (DRSO)*, that does not rely on the notion of a known true underlying distribution. One chooses a set $\mathfrak{M}$ of probability

distributions to hedge against, then finds a decision that provides the best hedge against the set $\mathfrak{M}$ of distributions by solving the following minimax problem:

$$[\text{DRSO}] \quad \inf_{x\in X} \sup_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{E}_\mu[\Psi(x,\xi)]. \tag{1}$$

Such an approach has its roots in Von Neumann's game theory and has been used in many fields such as inventory management (Scarf et al. [46], Gallego and Moon [24]), statistical decision analysis (Berger [10]), as well as stochastic optimization (Žáčková [56], Dupačová [19], Shapiro and Kleywegt [48]). Recently it regained attention in the operations research literature, and sometimes is called data-driven stochastic optimization or ambiguous stochastic optimization.

A good choice of $\mathfrak{M}$ should take into account the properties of the practical application as well as the tractability of (1). Two typical ways of constructing $\mathfrak{M}$ are moment-based and statistical-distance-based. The moment-based approach considers distributions whose moments (such as mean and covariance) satisfy certain conditions (Scarf et al. [46], Delage and Ye [18], Popescu [43], Zymler et al. [58]). It has been shown that in many cases the resulting DRSO problem can be formulated as a conic quadratic or semi-definite program. However, the moment-based approach is based on the curious assumption that certain conditions on the moments are known exactly but that nothing else about the relevant distribution is known. More often in applications, either one has data from repeated observations of the quantity ξ, or one has no data, and in both cases the moment conditions do not describe exactly what is known about ξ. In addition, the resulting worst-case distribution sometimes yields overly conservative decisions (Wang et al. [55], Goh and Sim [26]). For example, Wang et al. [55] shows that for the newsvendor problem, by hedging against all the distributions with fixed mean and variance, Scarf's moment approach yields a two-point worst-case distribution, and the resulting decision does not perform well under other more likely scenarios.

The statistical-distance-based approach considers distributions that are close, in the sense of a chosen statistical distance, to a nominal distribution ν, such as an empirical distribution or a Gaussian distribution (El Ghaoui et al. [20], Calafiore and El Ghaoui [15]). Popular choices of the statistical distance are ϕ-divergences (Bayraksan and Love [6], Ben-Tal et al. [8]), which include Kullback-Leibler divergence (Jiang and Guan [31]), Burg entropy (Wang et al. [55]), and Total Variation distance (Sun and Xu [51]) as special cases, Prokhorov metric (Erdoğan and Iyengar [21]), and Wasserstein distance (Esfahani and Kuhn [22], Zhao and Guan [57]).

1.1. Motivation: Potential issues with ϕ-divergence Despite its widespread use, ϕ-divergence has a number of shortcomings. Here we highlight some of these shortcomings. In a typical setup using ϕ-divergence, Ξ is partitioned into $\bar{B}+1$ bins represented by points $\xi^0,\xi^1,\ldots,\xi^{\bar{B}}\in\Xi$. The nominal distribution $\boldsymbol{q}$ associates N_i observations with bin i. That is, the nominal distribution is given by $\boldsymbol{q}:=(N_0/N,N_1/N,\ldots,N_{\bar{B}}/N)$, where $N:=\sum_{i=0}^{\bar{B}}N_i$. Let $\Delta_{\bar{B}}:=\{(p_0,p_1,\ldots,p_{\bar{B}})\in\mathbb{R}_+^{\bar{B}+1}:\sum_{j=0}^{\bar{B}}p_j=1\}$ denote the set of probability distributions on the same set of bins. Let $\phi:[0,\infty)\mapsto\mathbb{R}$ be a chosen convex function such that $\phi(1)=0$, with the conventions that $0\phi(a/0):=a\lim_{t\to\infty}\phi(t)/t$ for all $a>0$, and $0\phi(0/0):=0$. Then the ϕ-divergence between $\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}\in\Delta_{\bar{B}}$ is defined by

$$I_\phi(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}) \;:=\; \sum_{j=0}^{\bar{B}} q_j\phi\left(\frac{p_j}{q_j}\right). \tag{2}$$

Let $\theta\geq 0$ denote a chosen radius. Then $\mathfrak{M}:=\{\boldsymbol{p}\in\Delta_{\bar{B}}:I_\phi(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})\leq\theta\}$ denotes the set of probability distributions given by the chosen ϕ-divergence and radius θ. The DRSO problem corresponding to the ϕ-divergence ball $\mathfrak{M}$ is then given by

$$\inf_{x\in X}\sup_{\boldsymbol{p}\in\Delta_{\bar{B}}}\left\{\sum_{j=0}^{\bar{B}}p_j\Psi(x,\xi^j)\;:\;I_\phi(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})\leq\theta\right\}. \tag{3}$$

It has been shown in Ben-Tal et al. [8] that the ϕ-divergence ball $\mathfrak{M}$ can be viewed as a statistical confidence region (Pardo [39]), and for several choices of ϕ, the inner maximization problem of (3) is tractable.

One well-known shortcoming of ϕ-divergence balls is that they are not rich enough to contain distributions that are often relevant. For example, for some choices of ϕ-divergence such as Kullback-Leibler divergence, if the nominal $q_i = 0$, then $p_i = 0$, that is, the ϕ-divergence ball $\mathfrak{M}$ includes only distributions that are absolutely continuous with respect to the nominal distribution $\boldsymbol{q}$, and thus does not include distributions with support on points where the nominal distribution $\boldsymbol{q}$ is not supported. As a result, if $\Xi = \mathbb{R}^s$ and $\boldsymbol{q}$ is discrete, then there are no continuous distributions in the ϕ-divergence ball $\mathfrak{M}$. Some choices of ϕ-divergence such as Burg entropy exhibit in some sense the opposite behavior — the ϕ-divergence ball $\mathfrak{M}$ includes distributions with some amount of probability allowed to be shifted from $\boldsymbol{q}$ to any set $E \subset \Xi$, with the amount of probability allowed to be shifted depending only on θ and not on how extreme the set E is. See Section 5.1 for more details regarding this potential shortcoming. Next we illustrate another shortcoming of ϕ-divergence that will motivate the use of Wasserstein distance.

EXAMPLE 1. Suppose that there is an underlying true image (1b), and a decision maker possesses, instead of the true image, an approximate image (1a) obtained with a less than perfect device that loses some of the contrast. The images are summarized by their gray-scale histograms. (In fact, (1a) was obtained from (1b) by a low-contrast intensity transformation (Gonzalez and Woods [27]), by which the black pixels become somewhat whiter and the white pixels become somewhat blacker. This type of transformation operates only on the gray-scale of a pixel and not on the location of a pixel, and therefore it can also be regarded as a transformation from one gray-scale histogram to another gray-scale histogram.) As a result, the observed histogram $\boldsymbol{q}$ is obtained by shifting the true histogram $\boldsymbol{p}_{true}$ inwards. Also consider the pathological image (1c) that is too dark to see many details, with histogram $\boldsymbol{p}_{pathol}$. Suppose that the decision maker constructs a Kullback-Leibler (K-L) divergence ball $\mathfrak{M} = \{\boldsymbol{p} \in \Delta_{\bar{B}} : I_{\phi_{kl}}(\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}) \le \theta\}$. Note that $I_{\phi_{kl}}(\boldsymbol{p}_{true}, \boldsymbol{q}) = 5.05 > I_{\phi_{kl}}(\boldsymbol{p}_{pathol}, \boldsymbol{q}) = 2.33$. Therefore, if θ is chosen small enough (less than 2.33) that $\mathfrak{M}$ excludes the pathological image (1c), then $\mathfrak{M}$ will also exclude the true image (1b). If θ is chosen large enough (greater than 5.05) that $\mathfrak{M}$ includes the true image (1b), then $\mathfrak{M}$ also has to include the pathological image (1c), and then the resulting decision may be overly conservative due to hedging against irrelevant distributions. If an intermediate value is chosen for θ (between 2.33 and 5.05), then $\mathfrak{M}$ includes the pathological image (1c) and excludes the true image (1b). In contrast, note that the Wasserstein distance W_1 satisfies $W_1(\boldsymbol{p}_{true}, \boldsymbol{q}) = 30.7 < W_1(\boldsymbol{p}_{pathol}, \boldsymbol{q}) = 84.0$, and thus Wasserstein distance does not exhibit the problem encountered with K-L divergence.

The reason for such behavior is that ϕ-divergence does not incorporate a notion of how close two points $\xi, \xi' \in \Xi$ are to each other, for example, how likely it is that ξ' is observed given that the true value is ξ. In Example 1, $\Xi = \{0, 1, \ldots, 255\}$ represents 8-bit gray-scale levels. The absolute difference between two points $\xi, \xi' \in \Xi$ reflects their perceptual closeness in color, and sometimes the likelihood that a pixel with gray-scale ξ is observed with gray-scale ξ'. However, in the definition of ϕ-divergence, only the relative ratio p_j/q_j for the *same* gray-scale level j is compared, while the distance between different gray-scale levels is not taken into account. This phenomenon has been observed in the field of image retrieval (Rubner et al. [45], Ling and Okada [34]). We consider DRSO problems based on sets $\mathfrak{M}$ that incorporate a notion of how close two points $\xi, \xi' \in \Xi$ are to each other. One such choice of $\mathfrak{M}$ is based on Wasserstein distance.

1.2. Related work Wasserstein distance and the related field of *optimal transport*, which is a generalization of the transportation problem, have been studied in depth. In 1942, together with the newborn linear programming (Kantorovich [33]), Kantorovich [32] tackled Monge's problem originally brought up in the study of optimal transport. In the stochastic optimization literature, Wasserstein distance has been used for multistage stochastic optimization (Pflug and Pichler [41]). Recently, Esfahani and Kuhn [22] and Zhao and Guan [57] showed that under certain conditions



(a) Observed image with histogram $\boldsymbol{q}$ (b) True image with histogram $\boldsymbol{p}_{true}$ (c) Pathological image with histogram $\boldsymbol{p}_{pathol}$

FIGURE 1. Three images and their gray-scale histograms. For K-L divergence, it holds that $I_{\phi_{kl}}(\boldsymbol{p}_{true}, \boldsymbol{q}) = 5.05 > I_{\phi_{kl}}(\boldsymbol{p}_{pathol}, \boldsymbol{q}) = 2.33$, while in contrast, with Wasserstein distance $W_1(\boldsymbol{p}_{true}, \boldsymbol{q}) = 30.70 < W_1(\boldsymbol{p}_{pathol}, \boldsymbol{q}) = 84.03$.

the DRSO problem with Wasserstein distance is tractable, by transforming the inner maximization problem

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[\Psi(x, \xi)] \tag{4}$$

into a finite dimensional problem using tools from infinite dimensional convex optimization.

1.3. Main contributions

- *General Setting.* We prove a strong duality result for DRSO problems with Wasserstein distance in a very general setting. Specifically, consider any underlying metric d on Ξ, any $p \geq 1$, and any nominal distribution ν on Ξ. Let $\mathcal{P}(\Xi)$ denote the set of Borel probability measures on Ξ, and let W_p denote the Wasserstein distance of order p. We show that

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[\Psi(x, \xi)] : W_p(\mu, \nu) \leq \theta \right\} \quad = \quad \min_{\lambda \geq 0} \left\{ \lambda \theta^p - \int_{\Xi} \inf_{\xi \in \Xi} [\lambda d^p(\xi, \zeta) - \Psi(x, \xi)] \nu(d\zeta) \right\}$$

  holds for any Polish space (Ξ, d) and function Ψ that is upper semi-continuous in ξ (Theorem 1).

  1. Both Esfahani and Kuhn [22] and Zhao and Guan [57] assume that Ξ is a convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^s$ with some associated norm. The greater generality of our results enables one to consider interesting problems such as the process control problem (Section 4.1), where Ξ is the set of finite counting measures on $[0, 1]$, which is infinite-dimensional and non-convex.
  2. Both Esfahani and Kuhn [22] and Zhao and Guan [57] assume that the nominal distribution ν is an empirical distribution, while we allow ν to be any Borel probability measure. The greater generality enables one to study worst-case Value-at-Risk analysis (Section 4.2).
  3. We consider Wasserstein distance of any order $p \geq 1$, while in Esfahani and Kuhn [22] and Zhao and Guan [57] only $p = 1$ is considered. The greater generality enables us to identify the necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a worst-case distribution.

- *Existence Conditions for and Insightful Structure of Worst-case Distributions.* We identify necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of worst-case distributions (Theorem 1). For data-driven DRSO problems where $\nu = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\delta_{\widehat{\xi}^i}$ (where δ_ξ denotes the unit mass on ξ), whenever a worst-case distribution exists, there is a worst-case distribution μ^* supported on at most $N+1$ points with a concise structure

$$\mu^* \;=\; \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i\neq i_0}^{N}\delta_{\xi_*^i} + \frac{p_0}{N}\delta_{\underline{\xi}_*^{i_0}} + \frac{1-p_0}{N}\delta_{\overline{\xi}_*^{i_0}},$$

for some $p_0 \in [0,1]$ and

$$\xi_*^i \;\in\; \arg\max_{\xi\in\Xi}\left\{\Psi(x,\xi) - \lambda^* d^p(\xi,\widehat{\xi}^i)\right\},\quad \forall\, i\neq i_0,\quad \underline{\xi}_*^{i_0}, \overline{\xi}_*^{i_0} \;\in\; \arg\max_{\xi\in\Xi}\left\{\Psi(x,\xi) - \lambda^* d^p(\xi,\widehat{\xi}^{i_0})\right\},$$

where λ^* is the dual minimizer (Corollary 2). Thus μ^* can be viewed as a perturbation of ν, where the mass on $\widehat{\xi}^i$ is perturbed to ξ_*^i for all $i \neq i_0$, a fraction p_0 of the mass on $\widehat{\xi}^{i_0}$ is perturbed to $\underline{\xi}^{i_0}$, and the remaining fraction $1-p_0$ of the mass on $\widehat{\xi}^{i_0}$ is perturbed to $\overline{\xi}^{i_0}$. In particular, uncertainty quantification problems have a worst-case distribution with this simple structure, and can be solved by a greedy procedure (Example 7).
- *Constructive Proof of Duality.* The basic idea of the proof is to use first-order optimality conditions of the dual problem to construct a sequence of primal feasible solutions that approaches the dual optimal value. Such a constructive proof is in contrast with the common existence proof of duality on the basis of the separating hyperplane theorem (see, e.g. Boyd and Vandenberghe [14] for a proof of Fenchel duality). Moreover, our proof approach is more direct in the sense that we do not resort to tools from infinite-dimensional convex optimization as in the proofs of Esfahani and Kuhn [22] and Zhao and Guan [57]. Moreover, our proof approach can be applied to problems other than DRSO problems, such as a class of distributionally robust transportation problems considered in Carlsson et al. [16] (Section 5.3).
- *Connection with Robust Optimization.* Using the structure of a worst-case distribution, we prove that data-driven DRSO problems can be approximated by robust optimization problems to any accuracy (Corollary 2). We use this result to show that two-stage linear DRSO problems have a tractable semi-definite programming approximation (Section 5.2). Moreover, the robust optimization approximation becomes exact when the objective function Ψ is concave in ξ. In addition, if Ψ is convex in x, then the corresponding DRSO problem can be formulated as a convex-concave saddle point problem.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review some results on the Wasserstein distance. Next we prove strong duality for general and finite-supported nominal distributions in Section 3. Then, in Sections 4 and 5, we apply strong duality and the structural description of worst-case distributions to a variety of DRSO problems. We conclude this paper in Section 6. Proofs of Lemmas and Propositions are provided in the Appendix.

2. Notation and Preliminaries In this section, we introduce notation and briefly outline some known results regarding Wasserstein distance. For a more detailed discussion we refer to Villani [52, 53].

Let Ξ be a Polish (separable complete metric) space with metric d. The metric space (Ξ, d) is said to be *totally bounded* if for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a finite covering of Ξ by ϵ-balls. By Theorem 45.1 in Munkres [36], a metric space is compact if and only if it is complete and totally bounded. Let $\mathscr{B}(\Xi)$ denote the Borel σ-algebra on Ξ, and let $\mathscr{B}_\nu$ denote the *completion* of $\mathscr{B}(\Xi)$ with respect to a measure ν in $\mathscr{B}(\Xi)$ such that the measure space $(\Xi, \mathscr{B}_\nu, \nu)$ is complete (see, e.g., Definition 1.11 in Ambrosio et al. [1]). Let $\mathcal{B}(\Xi)$ denote the set of Borel measures on Ξ, let $\mathcal{P}(\Xi)$

denote the set of Borel probability measures on Ξ, and let $\mathcal{P}_p(\Xi)$ denote the subset of $\mathcal{P}(\Xi)$ with finite p-th moment for $p \in [1, \infty)$:

$$\mathcal{P}_p(\Xi) \;:=\; \Big\{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi) \,:\, \int_\Xi d^p(\xi, \zeta_0)\mu(d\xi) < \infty \text{ for some } \zeta_0 \in \Xi\Big\}.$$

It follows from the triangle inequality that the definition above does not depend on the choice of ζ_0.

Definition 1 (Push-forward Measure). Given measurable spaces Ξ and Ξ', a measurable function $T : \Xi \mapsto \Xi'$, and a measure $\nu \in \mathcal{B}(\Xi)$, let $T_\# \nu \in \mathcal{B}(\Xi')$ denote the *push-forward measure of* ν *through* T, defined by

$$T_\#\nu(A) \;:=\; \nu(T^{-1}(A)) \;=\; \nu\{\zeta \in \Xi \,:\, T(\zeta) \in A\},\ \forall \text{ measurable sets } A \subset \Xi'.$$

That is, $T_\#\nu$ is obtained by *transporting* ("pushing forward") ν from Ξ to Ξ' using the function T.

Let $\pi^i : \Xi \times \Xi \mapsto \Xi$ denote the canonical projections given by $\pi^i(\xi_1, \xi_2) = \xi_i$. Given a measure $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi \times \Xi)$, let $\pi^i_\#\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)$ denote the i-th marginal of γ given by $\pi^1_\#\gamma(A) = \gamma(A \times \Xi)$ and $\pi^2_\#\gamma(A) = \gamma(\Xi \times A)$.

Definition 2 (Wasserstein distance). The *Wasserstein distance* $W_p(\mu, \nu)$ between $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\Xi)$ is defined by

$$W_p^p(\mu, \nu) \;:=\; \min_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi \times \Xi)} \left\{ \int_{\Xi \times \Xi} d^p(\xi, \zeta)\gamma(d\xi, d\zeta) \,:\, \pi^1_\#\gamma = \mu, \pi^2_\#\gamma = \nu \right\}. \tag{5}$$

That is, the Wasserstein distance between μ, ν is the minimum cost (in terms of d^p) of redistributing mass from ν to μ, which is why it is also called the "earth mover's distance" in the computer science literature. Wasserstein distance is a natural way of comparing two distributions when one is obtained from the other by *perturbations*. The minimum on the right side of (5) is attained, because d is lower semicontinuous. The following example is a familiar special case of problem (5).

Example 2 (Transportation problem). When $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^M p_i \delta_{\xi^i}$ and $\nu = \sum_{j=1}^N q_j \delta_{\widehat{\xi}^j}$, where $M, N \geq 1$, $p_i, q_j \geq 0$, $\xi^i, \widehat{\xi}^j \in \Xi$ for all i, j, and $\sum_{i=1}^M p_i = \sum_{j=1}^N q_j = 1$. Then problem (5) becomes the classical transportation problem in linear programming:

$$\min_{\gamma_{ij} \geq 0} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^N d^p(\xi^i, \widehat{\xi}^j)\gamma_{ij} \;:\; \sum_{j=1}^N \gamma_{ij} = p_i, \forall\, i,\ \sum_{i=1}^M \gamma_{ij} = q_j, \forall\, j \right\}.$$

Remark 1. Carlsson et al. [16] suggested that the Wasserstein distance is a natural choice for certain transportation problems as it inherits the cost structure. As pointed out in Blanchet and Murthy [11], it may be of interest to use a cost function d that is not symmetric. Although Wasserstein distance is usually based on a metric d, many of the results continue to hold if d is not symmetric.

Example 3 (Revisiting Example 1). Next we evaluate the Wasserstein distance between the histograms in Example 1. To evaluate $W_1(\boldsymbol{p}_{true}, \boldsymbol{q})$, note that the least cost way of transporting mass from $\boldsymbol{q}$ to $\boldsymbol{p}_{true}$ is to move the mass near the boundary outwards. In contrast, to evaluate $W_1(\boldsymbol{p}_{pathol}, \boldsymbol{q})$, one has to transport mass relatively long distances from right to left, resulting in a larger cost than $W_1(\boldsymbol{p}_{true}, \boldsymbol{q})$. Therefore $W_1(\boldsymbol{p}_{pathol}, \boldsymbol{q}) > W_1(\boldsymbol{p}_{true}, \boldsymbol{q})$.

Given the order $p \in [1, \infty)$, a nominal distribution $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\Xi)$, and a radius $\theta > 0$, the Wasserstein ball of probability distributions $\mathfrak{M} \subset \mathcal{P}_p(\Xi)$ is defined by

$$\mathfrak{M} \;:=\; \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\Xi) \,:\, W_p(\mu, \nu) \leq \theta\}. \tag{6}$$

Thanks to concentration inequalities for Wasserstein distance (cf. Bolley et al. [12], Fournier and Guillin [23]), it has been pointed out in Esfahani and Kuhn [22] that Wasserstein balls provide good out-of-sample performance.

Wasserstein distance has a dual representation due to Kantorovich's duality:

$$W_p^p(\mu,\nu) \;=\; \sup_{u\in L^1(\mu),v\in L^1(\nu)} \left\{ \int_\Xi u(\xi)\mu(d\xi) + \int_\Xi v(\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) \;:\; u(\xi)+v(\zeta)\le d^p(\xi,\zeta),\ \forall\, \xi,\zeta\in\Xi \right\}, \quad (7)$$

where $L^1(\nu)$ represents the L^1 space of ν-measurable (i.e., $(\mathscr{B}_\nu, \mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}))$-measurable) functions. In addition, the set of functions under the maximum above can be replaced by $u, v \in C_b(\Xi)$, where $C_b(\Xi)$ is the set of continuous and bounded real-valued functions on Ξ. Particularly, when $p=1$, by the Kantorovich-Rubinstein Theorem, (7) can be simplified to

$$W_1(\mu,\nu) \;=\; \sup_{u\in L^1(\mu)} \left\{ \int_\Xi u(\xi) d(\mu-\nu)(\xi) \;:\; u \text{ is 1-Lipschitz} \right\}.$$

So for an L-Lipschitz function $\Psi : \Xi \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, it holds that $\left|\mathbb{E}_\mu[\Psi(\xi)] - \mathbb{E}_\nu[\Psi(\xi)]\right| \le LW_1(\mu,\nu) \le L\theta$ for all $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}$. The following lemma generalizes this statement.

LEMMA 1. *Let $\Psi : \Xi \mapsto \mathbb{R}$. Suppose Ψ satisfies $|\Psi(\xi)-\Psi(\zeta)| \le Ld^p(\xi,\zeta)+M$ for some $L, M \ge 0$ and all $\xi,\zeta\in\Xi$. Then*

$$\left|\mathbb{E}_\mu[\Psi(\xi)] - \mathbb{E}_\nu[\Psi(\xi)]\right| \;\le\; L\theta^p + M, \quad \forall\ \mu\in\mathfrak{M}.$$

We remark that Definition 2 and the results above can be extended to Borel measures. Moreover, we have the following result.

LEMMA 2. *For any Borel measures $\mu,\nu\in\mathcal{B}(\Xi)$ with $\mu(\Xi)\ne\nu(\Xi)<\infty$, it holds that $W_p(\mu,\nu)=\infty$.*

Another important feature of Wasserstein distance is that W_p metrizes weak convergence in $\mathcal{P}_p(\Xi)$ (cf. Theorem 6.9 in Villani [53]). That is, for any sequence $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of measures in $\mathcal{P}_p(\Xi)$ and $\mu\in\mathcal{P}_p(\Xi)$, it holds that $\lim_{k\to\infty} W_p(\mu_k,\mu)=0$ if and only if μ_k converges weakly to μ and $\int_\Xi d^p(\xi,\zeta_0)\mu_k(d\xi) \to \int_\Xi d^p(\xi,\zeta_0)\mu(d\xi)$ as $k\to\infty$. Therefore, convergence in the Wasserstein distance of order p implies convergence up to the p-th moment. Villani [53, chapter 6] discusses the advantages of Wasserstein distance relative to other distances, such as the Prokhorov metric, that metrize weak convergence.

3. Tractable Reformulation via Duality. Problem (4) involves a supremum over infinitely many distributions, which makes it difficult to solve. In this section we develop a tractable reformulation of (4) by deriving its strong dual. We suppress the variable x of Ψ, and all results in this section are interpreted pointwise, thus problem (4) is rewritten as

$$\text{[Primal]} \quad v_P \;:=\; \sup_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(\Xi)} \left\{ \int_\Xi \Psi(\xi)\mu(d\xi) \;:\; W_p(\mu,\nu)\le\theta \right\}, \quad (8)$$

where $\theta>0$, $\nu\in\mathcal{P}_p(\Xi)$ and $\Psi\in L^1(\nu)$. In Proposition 1, we derive its (weak) dual

$$\text{[Dual]} \quad v_D \;:=\; \inf_{\lambda\ge0} \left\{ \lambda\theta^p - \int_\Xi \inf_{\xi\in\Xi} \left[\lambda d^p(\xi,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi)\right]\nu(d\zeta) \right\}. \quad (9)$$

Our main goal is to show strong duality holds, i.e., $v_P = v_D$, and identify the condition for the existence of worst-case distribution, which turns out to be related to the growth rate of $\Psi(\xi)$ as ξ approaches to infinity. More specifically, for some fixed $\zeta_0\in\Xi$, we define the growth rate κ by

$$\text{[Growth Rate]} \quad \kappa := \limsup_{d(\xi,\zeta_0)\to\infty} \frac{\Psi(\xi)-\Psi(\zeta_0)}{d^p(\xi,\zeta_0)}, \quad (10)$$

provided that Ξ is unbounded. If Ξ is bounded, by convention we set $\kappa=0$. We note that the value of κ does not depend on the choice of ζ_0, as proved in Lemma 4 in the Appendix. In the sequel, we assume Ψ is upper semi-continuous and $\kappa<\infty$.

3.1. General nominal distribution We first prove strong duality for general nominal distribution ν. Such generality broadens the applicability of the DRSO. For example, the result is useful when the nominal distribution is some parametric distribution such as Gaussian distribution (Section 4.2), or even some stochastic processes (Section 4.1). The idea of proof is straightforward, though we have to take care of some technical details, such as the *measurability* of the inner infimum involved in (9), and the difficulty resulting from the *unboundedness* of Ξ. We first use the Lagrangian to derive the weak dual (9), which is a one-dimensional convex minimization problem since there is only one constraint in the primal (8). Then by exploiting the first-order optimality of the dual, we construct a sequence of primal feasible solutions which converges to the dual optimal value, and thus strong duality follows.

DEFINITION 3 (REGULARIZATION OPERATOR Φ). We define $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \times \Xi \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ by

$$\Phi(\lambda, \zeta) := \inf_{\xi \in \Xi} \left\{ \lambda d^p(\xi, \zeta) - \Psi(\xi) \right\}. \tag{11}$$

For $\delta > 0$, we also define

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{D}(\lambda, \zeta) &:= \limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} \left\{ d(\xi, \zeta) : \lambda d^p(\xi, \zeta) - \Psi(\xi) \le \Phi(\lambda, \zeta) + \delta \right\}, \\ \underline{D}(\lambda, \zeta) &:= \liminf_{\delta \downarrow 0} \left\{ d(\xi, \zeta) : \lambda d^p(\xi, \zeta) - \Psi(\xi) \le \Phi(\lambda, \zeta) + \delta \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

We note that the set on the right-hand side of (12) is the set of δ-minimizers of $\inf_{\xi \in \Xi} \left\{ \lambda d^p(\xi, \zeta) - \Psi(\xi) \right\}$. Also note that Φ can be viewed as a regularization of $-\Psi$. In fact, when $p = 2$ and $\lambda > 0$, $\Phi(\lambda, \zeta)$ is the classical *Moreau-Yosida regularization* (cf. Parikh and Boyd [40]) of $-\Psi$ with parameter $1/\lambda$ at ζ.

PROPOSITION 1 **(Weak duality).** *Suppose that $\kappa < \infty$. Then $v_P \le v_D$.*

Proof. Writing the Lagrangian and applying the minimax inequality yields that

$$\begin{aligned} v_P &= \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)} \inf_{\lambda \ge 0} \left\{ \int_\Xi \Psi(\xi) \mu(d\xi) + \lambda(\theta^p - W_p^p(\mu, \nu)) \right\} \\ &\le \inf_{\lambda \ge 0} \left\{ \lambda \theta^p + \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)} \left\{ \int_\Xi \Psi(\xi) \mu(d\xi) - \lambda W_p^p(\mu, \nu) \right\} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

To provide an upper bound on $\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)} \left\{ \int_\Xi \Psi(\xi) \mu(d\xi) - \lambda W_p^p(\mu, \nu) \right\}$, using (7) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)} \left\{ \int_\Xi \Psi(\xi) \mu(d\xi) - \lambda W_p^p(\mu, \nu) \right\} \\ &= \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)} \left\{ \int_\Xi \Psi(\xi) \mu(d\xi) - \lambda \sup_{u \in L^1(\mu), v \in L^1(\nu)} \left\{ \int_\Xi u(\xi) \mu(d\xi) + \int_\Xi v(\zeta) \nu(d\zeta) : \right. \right. \\ &\qquad \left. \left. v(\zeta) \le \inf_{\xi \in \Xi} \left[d^p(\xi, \zeta) - u(\xi) \right], \forall\, \zeta \in \Xi \right\} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $u_\lambda := \Psi / \lambda$ for $\lambda > 0$, then $u_\lambda \in L^1(\mu)$ due to $\kappa < \infty$ and Lemma 1. Plugging u_λ into the inner supremum for u, we obtain that for $\lambda > 0$,

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)} \left\{ \int_\Xi \Psi(\xi) \mu(d\xi) - \lambda W_p^p(\mu, \nu) \right\} \le - \int_\Xi \inf_{\xi \in \Xi} \left[\lambda d^p(\xi, \zeta) - \Psi(\xi) \right] \nu(d\zeta) = - \int_\Xi \Phi(\lambda, \zeta) \nu(d\zeta).$$

Note that the inequality above holds also for $\lambda = 0$, combining it with (13) we obtain the result. □

We next prepare some properties of Φ for the proof of strong duality. Similar results can be found in Ambrosio et al. [2].

LEMMA 3 **(Property of Φ).** *(i) [Boundedness] Let $\lambda > \lambda_1 \geq \kappa$. Then*

$$\frac{\lambda - \lambda_1}{2} \overline{D}^p(\lambda, \zeta) \quad \leq \quad \Phi(\lambda, \zeta) - \Phi(\lambda_1, \zeta_0) + C d^p(\zeta, \zeta_0), \quad \forall\ \zeta \in \Xi,$$

where C is a constant dependent only on λ, λ_1 and p.

(ii) [Continuity] Φ is concave and non-decreasing in λ and is continuous on $(\kappa, \infty) \times \Xi$. In addition, $\lim_{\lambda \downarrow \kappa} \Phi(\lambda, \zeta) = \Phi(\kappa, \zeta)$ provided that $\Phi(\kappa, \zeta) > -\infty$.

(iii) [Monotonicity] Let $\lambda_2 \geq \lambda_1$ be such that $\Phi(\lambda_i, \zeta) > -\infty$, $i = 1, 2$. Then $\overline{D}(\lambda_2, \zeta) \leq \underline{D}(\lambda_1, \zeta) \leq \overline{D}(\lambda_1, \zeta)$ for any $\zeta \in \Xi$.

(iv) [Derivative] For any $\lambda > \kappa$, the left partial derivative $\frac{\partial \Phi(\lambda, \zeta)}{\partial \lambda -}$ exist and satisfy

$$\overline{D}^p(\lambda, \zeta) \leq \frac{\partial \Phi(\lambda, \zeta)}{\partial \lambda -} \leq \lim_{\lambda_1 \uparrow \lambda} \underline{D}^p(\lambda_1, \zeta).$$

For any λ such that $\Phi(\lambda, \zeta) > -\infty$, the right partial derivative $\frac{\partial \Phi(\lambda, \zeta)}{\partial \lambda +}$ exist and satisfy

$$\lim_{\lambda_2 \downarrow \lambda} \overline{D}^p(\lambda_2, \zeta) \leq \frac{\partial \Phi(\lambda, \zeta)}{\partial \lambda +} \leq \underline{D}^p(\lambda, \zeta).$$

If $\Xi = \mathbb{R}^s$, then $\frac{\partial \Phi(\lambda, \zeta)}{\partial \lambda +} = \underline{D}^p(\lambda, \zeta) \leq \overline{D}^p(\lambda, \zeta) = \frac{\partial \Phi(\lambda, \zeta)}{\partial \lambda -}$.

(v) [Measurable selection] For any $\lambda > \kappa$ and $\delta, \epsilon > 0$, there exists ν-measurable maps $\overline{T}^\delta_\epsilon, \underline{T}^\delta_\epsilon : \Xi \to \Xi$ such that

$$\overline{T}^\delta_\epsilon(\zeta) \in \left\{ \xi \in \Xi :\ d(\xi, \zeta) + \epsilon \geq \sup_{\xi' \in \Xi} \left\{ d(\xi', \zeta) : \lambda d^p(\xi', \zeta) - \Psi(\xi') \leq \Phi(\lambda, \zeta) + \delta \right\} \right\}, \tag{14a}$$

$$\underline{T}^\delta_\epsilon(\zeta) \in \left\{ \xi \in \Xi :\ d(\xi, \zeta) - \epsilon \leq \inf_{\xi' \in \Xi} \left\{ d(\xi', \zeta) : \lambda d^p(\xi', \zeta) - \Psi(\xi') \leq \Phi(\lambda, \zeta) + \delta \right\} \right\}. \tag{14b}$$

Suppose $\Phi(\kappa, \zeta) > -\infty$. Then (14b) holds, and for any $R, \delta > 0$, there exists ν-measurable maps $\overline{T}^\delta_R : \Xi \to \Xi$, such that

$$\overline{T}^\delta_R(\zeta) \in \left\{ \xi \in \Xi :\ d(\xi, \zeta) \geq R,\ \kappa d^p(\xi, \zeta) - \Psi(\xi) \leq \Phi(\kappa, \zeta) + \delta \right\}. \tag{15}$$

When $\Xi = \mathbb{R}^s$ and $\{\xi \in \Xi : \lambda d^p(\xi, \zeta) - \Psi(\xi) = \Phi(\lambda, \zeta)\}$ is non-empty, (14b) holds also for $\epsilon = \delta = 0$. If the set $\{\xi \in \Xi : \lambda d^p(\xi', \zeta) - \Psi(\xi') \leq \Phi(\lambda, \zeta)\}$ is bounded, then (14a) holds also for $\epsilon = \delta = 0$, otherwise (15) holds also for $\delta = 0$.

Property (i) shows that for any fixed ζ and $\lambda > \kappa$, the set of δ-minimizers of the infimum in (11) is bounded, which is useful for establishing dominated convergence and taking care of the unboundedness of Ξ. Properties (ii) and (iii) are standard results similar to Moreau-Yosida regularization. Property (iv) will be used to compute the derivative of the dual objective. Finally, property (v) takes care of the measurability issues.

THEOREM 1 **(Strong duality).** *(i) The dual problem (9) always admits a minimizer λ^*.*

(ii) $v_P = v_D < \infty$.

(iii) If Ψ is concave, Ξ is convex, and $d^p(\cdot, \zeta)$ is convex for all $\zeta \in \Xi$, then

$$v_P \quad = \quad v_D \quad = \quad \sup_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}'} \mathbb{E}_\mu[\Psi(\xi)], \tag{16}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{M}' \quad := \quad \left\{ \mu = T_\# \nu \;\middle|\; T : \Xi \to \Xi,\ \int_\Xi d^p(\xi, T(\xi)) \nu(d\xi) \leq \theta^p \right\}. \tag{17}$$

Proof of Theorem 1. In view of weak duality (Proposition 1), it suffices to show $v_P \geq v_D$. Let $h:\mathbb{R}\mapsto\mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$h(\lambda) \;:=\; \lambda\theta^p - \int_\Xi \Phi(\lambda,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta).$$

By Lemma 3(ii), $h(\lambda)$ is the sum of a linear function $\lambda\theta^p$ and an extended real-valued convex function $-\int_\Xi \Phi(\lambda,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)$ on $[0,\infty)$. In addition, since $\Phi(\lambda,\zeta)\leq -\Psi(\zeta)$, it follows that $h(\lambda)\geq \lambda\theta^p + \int_\Xi \Psi(\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)\to\infty$ as $\lambda\to\infty$. Thus h is a convex function on $[0,\infty)$ tending to ∞ as $\lambda\to\infty$. Note that $\Phi(\lambda,\zeta)=-\infty$ for all $\lambda<\kappa$, so h admits a minimizer λ^* in $[\max(0,\kappa),\infty)$. To show $v_P=v_D$, consider the following two cases.

- Case 1. There exists a minimizer $\lambda^*>\kappa$. It follows that $h(\lambda^*)>-\infty$ and $\int_\Xi \Phi(\lambda^*,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)<\infty$. The first-order optimality conditions $\frac{\partial h(\lambda^*)}{\partial\lambda-}\leq 0$ and $\frac{\partial h(\lambda^*)}{\partial\lambda+}\geq 0$ read

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda+}\left(\int_\Xi \Phi(\lambda^*,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)\right)\leq\theta^p\leq\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda-}\left(\int_\Xi \Phi(\lambda^*,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)\right). \tag{18}$$

By Lemma 3(i) and (iv), we can apply dominated convergence theorem to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta^p &\geq \frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda+}\left(\int_\Xi \Phi(\lambda^*,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)\right)=\int_\Xi\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda+}\Phi(\lambda^*,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)\geq\int_\Xi\big[\lim_{\lambda_2\downarrow\lambda^*}\overline{D}^p(\lambda_2,\zeta)\big]\nu(d\zeta),\\
\theta^p &\leq \frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda-}\left(\int_\Xi \Phi(\lambda^*,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)\right)=\int_\Xi\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda-}\Phi(\lambda^*,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)\leq\int_\Xi\big[\lim_{\lambda_1\uparrow\lambda^*}\underline{D}^p(\lambda_1,\zeta)\big]\nu(d\zeta).
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

By Lemma 3(iii) and (v), for any $\epsilon>0$, there exists $\delta\in(0,\epsilon)$ and $\kappa<\lambda_1<\lambda^*<\lambda_2$, and ν-measurable maps $T_i^\delta:\Xi\to\Xi$, $i=1,2$, such that for any $\zeta\in\Xi$, $\lambda_i d^p(T_i^\delta(\zeta),\zeta)-\Psi(T_i^\delta(\zeta))\leq\Phi(\lambda_i,\zeta)+\delta$, and that

$$d(\underline{T}^\delta_{\lambda_1}(\zeta),\zeta)\geq\lim_{\lambda'\uparrow\lambda}\underline{D}(\lambda',\zeta)-\epsilon,\quad d(\overline{T}^\delta_{\lambda_2}(\zeta),\zeta)\leq\lim_{\lambda'\downarrow\lambda}\overline{D}(\lambda',\zeta)+\epsilon.$$

Combining with (19) yields that

$$\theta^p\geq\int_\Xi d^p(\overline{T}^\delta_{\lambda_2}(\zeta),\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)-\epsilon^p,\quad \theta^p\leq\int_\Xi d^p(\underline{T}^\delta_{\lambda_1}(\zeta),\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)+\epsilon^p.$$

Now we construct a primal solution μ_ϵ by

$$\mu_\epsilon := q_\epsilon q_1 T^\delta_{1\#}\nu + q_\epsilon(1-q_1)T^\delta_{2\#}\nu+(1-q_\epsilon)\nu, \tag{20}$$

where $q_1\in[0,1]$ satisfies

$$q_1\Big[\int_\Xi d^p(\underline{T}^\delta_{\lambda_1}(\zeta),\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)+\epsilon^p\Big]+(1-q_1)\Big[\int_\Xi d^p(\overline{T}^\delta_{\lambda_2}(\zeta),\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)-\epsilon^p\Big]=\theta^p, \tag{21}$$

and $q_\epsilon=\frac{\theta^p}{\theta^p+\max(0,(1-2q_1))\epsilon^p}$. Then by construction μ_ϵ is feasible. Furthermore, observe that

$$\lambda_i d^p(T_i^\delta(\zeta),\zeta)-\Phi(\lambda_i,\zeta)-\delta\leq\Psi(T_i^\delta(\zeta))\leq\lambda_i d^p(T_i^\delta(\zeta),\zeta)-\Phi(\lambda_i,\zeta),\quad i=1,2.$$

This, together with (21), implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Xi\Psi(\zeta)\mu_\epsilon(d\zeta)\\
=&q_\epsilon q_1\int_\Xi\Psi(\underline{T}^\delta_{\lambda_1}(\zeta))\nu(d\zeta)+q_\epsilon(1-q_1)\int_\Xi\Psi(\underline{T}^\delta_{\lambda_1}(\zeta))\nu(d\zeta)+(1-q_\epsilon)\int_\Xi\Psi(\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)\\
\geq&q_\epsilon q_1\int_\Xi\big[\lambda_1 d^p(\underline{T}^\delta_{\lambda_1}(\zeta),\zeta)-\Phi(\lambda_1,\zeta)-\delta\big]\nu(d\zeta)\\
&+q_\epsilon(1-q_1)\int_\Xi\big[\lambda_2 d^p(\overline{T}^\delta_{\lambda_2}(\zeta),\zeta)-\Phi(\lambda_2,\zeta)-\delta\big]\nu(d\zeta)+(1-q_\epsilon)\int_\Xi\Psi(\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)\\
\geq&q_\epsilon(\lambda_1\theta^p+(1-2q_1)\epsilon^p)-q_\epsilon q_1\int_\Xi\Phi(\lambda_1,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)-q_\epsilon q_2\int_\Xi\Phi(\lambda_2,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)-q_\epsilon\delta+(1-q_\epsilon)\int_\Xi\Psi(\zeta)\nu(d\zeta).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that as $\epsilon \to 0$, it holds that $q_\epsilon \to 1$, $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \to \lambda^*$ and $\delta \to 0$. Taking the limit on both sides on the inequality above and using monotone convergence, we conclude that $v_P \geq \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \int_\Xi \Psi(\zeta)\mu_\epsilon(d\zeta) \geq \lambda\theta^p - \int_\Xi \Phi(\lambda^*, \zeta)\nu(d\zeta) = v_D$.

- Case 2. $\lambda^* = \kappa$ is the unique dual minimizer. In this case, $\int_\Xi \Phi(\kappa, \zeta)\nu(d\zeta)$ is finite, and

$$\kappa\theta^p - \int_\Xi \Phi(\kappa,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) < \lambda\theta^p - \int_\Xi \Phi(\lambda,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) < \infty \Rightarrow \int_\Xi \frac{\Phi(\lambda,\zeta) - \Phi(\kappa,\zeta)}{\lambda - \kappa}\nu(d\zeta) < \theta^p, \ \ \forall \lambda > \kappa. \quad (22)$$

From Lemma 3(iv), for any $\lambda > \kappa$ and $\delta > 0$, there exists a ν-measurable map $T^\delta_\lambda : \Xi \mapsto \Xi$ such that $\lambda d^p(T^\delta_\lambda(\zeta), \zeta)\nu(d\zeta) \leq \Phi(\lambda, \zeta) + \delta$. Using the fact that $\Phi(\kappa, \zeta) \leq \kappa d^p(T^\delta_\lambda(\zeta), \zeta)\nu(d\zeta) - \Psi(T^\delta_\lambda(\zeta))$, we have $\Phi(\lambda, \zeta) - \Phi(\kappa, \zeta) \geq (\lambda - \kappa)d^p(T^\delta_\lambda(\zeta), \zeta) - \delta$. Combining with (22) yields

$$\int_\Xi d^p(T^\delta_\lambda(\zeta), \zeta)\nu(d\zeta) < \int_\Xi \frac{\Phi(\lambda,\zeta) - \Phi(\kappa,\zeta)}{\lambda - \kappa}\nu(d\zeta) + \delta.$$

By choosing $\delta < \theta^p - \int_\Xi \frac{\Phi(\lambda,\zeta)-\Phi(\kappa,\zeta)}{\lambda-\kappa}\nu(d\zeta)$, we have $\int_\Xi d^p(T^\delta_\lambda(\zeta), \zeta)\nu(d\zeta) < \theta^p$.

On the other hand, by Lemma 3(v), for any $R > 0$, there exists a ν-measurable map $T^\delta_R(\Xi)$ such that $d(T^\delta_R(\zeta), \zeta) > R$ and $\kappa d^p(T^\delta_R(\zeta), \zeta) - \Psi(T^\delta_R(\zeta)) \leq \Phi(\kappa, \zeta) + \delta$ for all $\zeta \in \Xi$. By choosing sufficiently large R, we can ensure $\int_\Xi d^p(T^\delta_R(\zeta), \zeta)\nu(d\zeta) > \theta^p$. We construct a primal solution

$$\mu^\delta_\lambda := qT^\delta_{\lambda\#}\nu + (1-q)T^\delta_{R\#}\nu, \quad (23)$$

where $q \in [0, 1]$ is chosen such that

$$q\int_\Xi d^p(T^\delta_\lambda(\zeta), \zeta)\nu(d\zeta) + (1-q)\int_\Xi d^p(T^\delta_R(\zeta), \zeta)\nu(d\zeta) = \theta^p.$$

Then by construction μ_δ is feasible, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Xi \Psi(\xi)\mu^\delta_\lambda(d\xi) =& q\int_\Xi \Psi(T^\delta_\lambda(\zeta))\nu(d\zeta) + (1-q)\int_\Xi \Psi(T^\delta_R(\zeta))\nu(d\zeta) \\
\geq& q\int_\Xi [\lambda d^p(T^\delta_\lambda(\zeta), \zeta) - \Phi(\lambda, \zeta) - \delta]\nu(d\zeta) + (1-q)\int_\Xi [\kappa d^p(T^\delta_R(\zeta), \zeta) - \Phi(\kappa, \zeta) - \delta]\nu(d\zeta) \\
\geq& \kappa\theta^p - q\lambda\int_\Xi \Phi(\lambda, \zeta)\nu(d\zeta) - (1-q)\int_\Xi \Phi(\kappa, \zeta)\nu(d\zeta) - \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\Phi(\kappa, \zeta) \leq \Phi(\lambda, \zeta) \leq -\Psi(\zeta)$, letting $\lambda \downarrow \kappa$ and $\delta \downarrow 0$, using dominated convergence and Lemma 3(ii), we conclude that $v_P \geq \kappa\theta^p - \int_\Xi \Phi(\kappa, \zeta)\nu(d\zeta) = v_D$.

To prove (iii), note that the concavity of Ψ implies $\kappa < \infty$. In the proof above (cf. (20) and (23)), redefine

$$\mu_\epsilon := \left[q_\epsilon q_1 T^\delta_1 + q_\epsilon(1-q_1)T^\delta_2 + (1-q_\epsilon)\mathrm{id}\right]_\#\nu, \quad \mu^\delta_\lambda := \left[qT^\delta_\lambda + (1-q)T^\delta_R\right]_\#\nu.$$

Then from convexity of $d^p(\cdot, \zeta)$, we have $\mu_\epsilon, \mu^\delta_\lambda \in \mathfrak{M}'$. Using the concavity of Ψ and applying the same argument as above, we can show that $\{\mu_\epsilon\}_\epsilon$ and $\{\mu^\delta_\lambda\}_{\lambda,\delta}$ are sequences of distributions approaching to optimality. $\square$

Now let us consider $\kappa = \infty$ and the degenerate case $\theta = 0$.

PROPOSITION 2. *Suppose $\kappa = \infty$ and $\theta > 0$. Then $v_P = v_D = \infty$.*

PROPOSITION 3. *Suppose $\theta = 0$ and $\kappa < \infty$. Then $v_P = v_D = \mathbb{E}_\nu[\Psi(\xi)]$.*

REMARK 2 (CHOOSING WASSERSTEIN ORDER p). Let $\zeta_0 \in \Xi$. Define

$$\underline{p} := \inf\left\{p \geq 1 : \limsup_{d(\zeta',\zeta_0)\to\infty} \frac{\Psi(\zeta') - \Psi(\zeta_0)}{d^p(\zeta', \zeta_0)} < \infty\right\}.$$

Proposition 2 suggests that a meaningful formulation of DRSO should be such that the Wasserstein order p is at least greater than or equal to $\underline{p}$. In both Esfahani and Kuhn [22] and Zhao and Guan [57] only $p=1$ is considered. By considering higher order p in our analysis, we have more flexibility to choose the ambiguity set and control the degree of conservativeness based on the information of function Ψ.

REMARK 3 (STRONG DUALITY FAILS TO HOLD WHEN $\kappa=\infty$ AND $\theta=0$). When $\kappa=\infty$ and $\theta=0$, we may not have strong duality. For example, let $\nu=\delta_{\xi^0}$ for some $\xi^0\in\Xi$. Then $W_p(\mu,\nu)=0$ implies that $\mu=\delta_{\xi^0}$, and thus $v_P=\Psi(\xi^0)$. However, $\Phi(\lambda,\xi^0)=\inf_{\xi\in\Xi}\lambda d^p(\xi,\xi^0)-\Psi(\xi)=-\infty$ for any $\lambda\geq 0$ since $\kappa=\infty$, so $v_D=\infty$. Nevertheless, when $\kappa<\infty$, we still have strong duality.

We then investigate the condition for the existence of the worst-case distribution. We mainly focus on $\Xi=\mathbb{R}^s$, since in this case, if the set $\{\xi:\lambda d^p(\xi,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi)=\Phi(\lambda,\zeta)\}$ is non-empty, then $\underline{T}_0^0(\zeta)$, $\overline{T}_0^0(\zeta)$ and $\overline{T}_R^0(\zeta)$ in Lemma 3(v) are well-defined. In fact, such properties (and thus Corollary 1 below) hold as long as the Polish space Ξ is such that every bounded set is totally bounded (cf. Theorem 45.1 in Munkres [36]). We introduce

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{D}_0(\lambda,\zeta)&:=\min_{\xi\in\Xi}\{d(\xi,\zeta):\lambda d^p(\xi,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi)=\Phi(\lambda,\zeta)\},\\ \overline{D}_0(\lambda,\zeta)&:=\max_{\xi\in\Xi}\{d(\xi,\zeta):\lambda d^p(\xi,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi)=\Phi(\lambda,\zeta)\},\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

Then $\underline{D}_0(\lambda,\zeta)$ and $\overline{D}_0(\lambda,\zeta)$ represent the closest and furthest distances between ζ and any point in $\arg\min_{\xi\in\Xi}\{\lambda d^p(\xi,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi)\}$ respectively, and are finite when $\lambda>\kappa$. In addition, if $\Phi(\kappa,\zeta)$ is finite, then $\underline{D}_0(\lambda,\zeta)$ is also finite (but $\overline{D}_0(\lambda,\zeta)$ can be infinite).

COROLLARY 1 **(Existence of worst-case distribution)**. *(i) Suppose $\Xi=\mathbb{R}^s$. The worst-case distribution exists if and only if any of the following holds:*

- *There exists a dual minimizer $\lambda^*>\kappa$,*
- *$\lambda^*=\kappa>0$ is the unique minimizer, the set $\{\xi\in\Xi:\kappa d^p(\xi,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi)=\Phi(\kappa,\zeta)\}$ is non-empty ν-almost everywhere, and*

$$\int_\Xi \underline{D}_0^p(\kappa,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)\leq\theta^p\leq\int_\Xi\overline{D}_0^p(\kappa,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta).\tag{25}$$

- *$\lambda^*=0$ is the unique minimizer, the set $\arg\max_{\xi\in\Xi}\Psi(\xi)$ is non-empty, and*

$$\int_\Xi \underline{D}_0^p(\kappa,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)\leq\theta^p.\tag{26}$$

(ii) Whenever the worst-case distribution exists, there exists one which can be represented as a convex combination of two distributions, each of which is a perturbation of ν:

$$\mu^*=p^*\overline{T}^*_{\#}\nu+(1-p^*)\underline{T}^*_{\#}\nu,$$

where $\#$ is defined in Definition 1, $p^*\in[0,1]$, and $\overline{T}^*,\underline{T}^*:\Xi\to\Xi$ satisfy

$$\overline{T}^*(\zeta),\underline{T}^*(\zeta)\in\{\xi\in\Xi:\ \lambda^*d^p(\xi,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi)=\Phi(\lambda^*,\zeta)\},\ \nu-a.e.\tag{27}$$

(iii) If $-\Psi(\zeta)\leq\inf_{\xi\in\Xi}\kappa d^p(\xi,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi)$ ν-almost everywhere, then $\lambda^*=\kappa$ for any $\theta>0$. Otherwise there is $\theta_0>0$ such that $\lambda^*>\kappa$ for any $\theta<\theta_0$ (and thus the worst-case distribution exists).

Comparing to Corollary 4.7 in Esfahani and Kuhn [22], Corollary 1(i) and (iii) provide a complete description of the necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of worst-case distribution. Note that Example 1 in Esfahani and Kuhn [22] corresponds to $\lambda^*=\kappa=1$.

EXAMPLE 4. We consider several examples that correspond to different cases in Theorem 1. In all these examples, let $\Xi=[0,\infty)$, $d(\xi,\zeta)=|\xi-\zeta|$ for all $\xi,\zeta\in\Xi$, $p=1$, $\theta>0$ and $\nu=\delta_0$.



(a) $\Psi_a(\xi) = \max(0, \xi - a)$ (b) $\Psi(\xi) = \max(1 - \xi^2, 0)$ (c) $\Psi_\pm(\xi) = 1 + \xi \pm \frac{1}{\xi+1}$

FIGURE 2. Examples for existence and non-existence of the worst-case distribution

(a) $\Psi_a(\xi) = \max(0, \xi - a)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that $\lambda^* = \kappa = 1$.
- When $a \le 0$, $\arg\min_{\xi \in \Xi}\{d^p(\xi, 0) - \Psi_a(\xi)\} = [0, \infty)$, whence $\underline{D}_0(\kappa, \zeta) = 0$ and $\overline{D}_0(\kappa, \zeta) = \infty$ satisfying condition (25). One of the worst-case distributions is $\mu^* = \delta_\theta$ with $v_P = v_D = \theta - a$.
- When $a > 0$, $\arg\min_{\xi \in \Xi}\{d^p(\xi, 0) - \Psi_a(\xi)\} = \{0\}$, whence $\underline{D}_0(\kappa, \zeta) = \overline{D}_0(\kappa, \zeta) = 0 < \theta$, thus condition (25) is violated. There is no worst-case distribution, but $\mu_\epsilon = (1 - \epsilon)\delta_0 + \epsilon\delta_{\theta/\epsilon}$ converges to $v_P = v_D = \theta$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.

(b) $\Psi(\xi) = \max(1 - \xi^2, 0)$. It follows that $\lambda^* = \kappa = 0$. $\arg\max_{\xi \in \Xi} \Psi(\xi) = \{0\}$ thus condition (26) is satisfied, and the worst-case distribution is $\mu^* = \delta_0 = \nu$.

(c) $\Psi_\pm(\xi) = 1 + \xi \pm \frac{1}{\xi+1}$. It follows that $\kappa = 1$. Note that $\Psi'_\pm(\xi) = 1 \mp \frac{1}{(\xi+1)^2}$.
- Ψ_+ satisfies the condition in (iii), thus $\lambda^*_+ = \kappa = 1$. $\arg\min_{\xi \in \Xi}\{d^p(\xi, 0) - \Psi_+(\xi)\} = \{0\}$. The worst-case distribution $\mu^* = \delta_\theta$, and $v_P = v_D = 1 + \theta + \frac{1}{\theta+1}$.
- $\Psi'_- > 1$ on Ξ, and for any θ, we have $\lambda^*_- > \kappa$. Indeed, we have $\arg\min_{\lambda \ge 0}\{\lambda\theta - \inf_{\xi \in \Xi}\{\lambda\xi - (1 + \xi - \frac{1}{\xi+1})\}\} = \arg\min_{\lambda \ge 0}\{\lambda(\theta + 1) - 2\sqrt{\lambda - 1}\} = 1 + \frac{1}{(\theta+1)^2} > 1 = \kappa$.

3.2. Finite-supported nominal distribution. In this subsection, we restrict attention to the case when the nominal distribution $\nu = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\widehat{\xi}^i}$ for some $\widehat{\xi}^i \in \Xi$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$. This occurs, for example, when the decision maker collects N observations that constitute an empirical distribution.

COROLLARY 2 **(Data-driven DRSO).** *Suppose $\nu = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\widehat{\xi}^i}$. Then the following hold:*

(i) The primal problem (8) has a strong dual problem

$$v_P = v_D = \min_{\lambda \ge 0}\left\{\lambda\theta^p + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \sup_{\xi \in \Xi}\left[\Psi(\xi) - \lambda d^p(\xi, \widehat{\xi}^i)\right]\right\}. \tag{28}$$

Moreover, $v_P = v_D$ also equal to

$$\sup_{\substack{\underline{\xi}^i, \overline{\xi}^i \in \Xi, i=1,\ldots,N \\ q_1, q_2 \ge 0, q_1 + q_2 \le 1}}\left\{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left[q_1\Psi(\underline{\xi}^i) + q_2\Psi(\overline{\xi}^i)\right] : \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left[q_1 d^p(\underline{\xi}^i, \widehat{\xi}^i) + q_2 d^p(\overline{\xi}^i, \widehat{\xi}^i)\right] \le \theta^p\right\}. \tag{29}$$

(ii) Assume $\kappa < \infty$. When Ξ is convex and Ψ is concave, (28) is further reduced to

$$\sup_{\xi^i \in \Xi}\left\{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \Psi(\xi^i) : \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N d^p(\xi^i, \widehat{\xi}^i) \le \theta\right\}. \tag{30}$$

(iii) [**Structure of the worst-case distribution**] *Whenever the worst-case distribution exists, there exists one which is supported on at most $N + 1$ points and has the form*

$$\mu^* = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i \ne i_0} \delta_{\xi^i_*} + \frac{p_0}{N}\delta_{\underline{\xi}^{i_0}_*} + \frac{1 - p_0}{N}\delta_{\overline{\xi}^{i_0}_*}, \tag{31}$$

where $1 \le i_0 \le N$, $p_0 \in [0,1]$, $\underline{\xi}_*^{i_0}, \overline{\xi}_*^{i_0} \in \arg\min_{\xi\in\Xi}\{\lambda^* d^p(\xi,\widehat{\xi}^{i_0}) - \Psi(\xi)\}$, *and* $\xi_*^i \in \arg\min_{\xi\in\Xi}\{\lambda^* d^p(\xi,\widehat{\xi}^i) - \Psi(\xi)\}$ *for all* $i \ne i_0$.

(iv) [**Robust-program approximation**] *Suppose there exists* $L, M \ge 0$ *such that* $|\Psi(\xi)-\Psi(\zeta)| < Ld(\xi,\zeta)+M$ *for all* $\xi,\zeta\in\Xi$. *Let* K *be any positive integer and define the robust program*

$$v_K := \sup_{(\xi^{ik})_{i,k}\in\mathfrak{M}_K} \frac{1}{NK}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{k=1}^K \Psi(\xi^{ik}),$$

with uncertainty set

$$\mathfrak{M}_K := \left\{(\xi^{ik})_{i,k} : \ \frac{1}{NK}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{k=1}^K d^p(\xi^{ik},\widehat{\xi}^i) \le \theta^p, \ \xi^{ik}\in\Xi, \ \forall i,k\right\}. \tag{32}$$

Then $v_K \uparrow \sup_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}}\mathbb{E}_\mu[\Psi(\xi)]$ *as* $K\to\infty$. *In particular, if* $\lambda^* > \kappa$, *it holds that*

$$v_K \le \sup_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}}\mathbb{E}_\mu[\Psi(\xi)] \le v_K + \frac{M+LD}{NK},$$

where D *is some constant independent of* K.

Statement (iii) shows the worst-case distribution μ^* is a *perturbation* of $\nu = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\widehat{\xi}^i}$, where $N-1$ out of N points $\{\widehat{\xi}^i\}_{i\ne i_0}$ are perturbed with full mass $1/N$ to ξ_*^i respectively, while at most one point $\widehat{\xi}^{i_0}$ is perturbed to two points $\underline{\xi}_*^{i_0}$ and $\overline{\xi}_*^{i_0}$. Using this structure, we obtain statement (iv), which suggests that problem (8) can be approximated by a robust program with uncertainty set $\mathfrak{M}_K$, which is a subset of $\mathfrak{M}$ that contains all distributions supported on NK points with equal probability $\frac{1}{NK}$.

Remark 4 (Total Variation metric). By choosing the discrete metric $d(\xi,\zeta) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi\ne\zeta\}}$ on Ξ, the Wasserstein distance is equal to Total Variation distance (Gibbs and Su [25]), which can be used for the situation where the distance of perturbation does not matter and provides a rather conservative decision. In this case, suppose θ is chosen such that $N\theta$ is an integer, then there is no fractional point in (31) and the problem is reduced to (30), whether Ξ (Ψ) is convex (concave) or not.

Proof of Corollary 2. (i) (ii) follows directly from the proof of Theorem 1 and Proposition 2. To prove (iii), by Corollary 1(ii), there exists a worst-case distribution which is supported on at most $2N$ points and has the form

$$\mu^* = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N p^i\delta_{\underline{\xi}_*^i} + (1-p^i)\delta_{\overline{\xi}_*^i}, \tag{33}$$

where $p^i\in[0,1]$, and $\underline{\xi}_*^i, \overline{\xi}_*^i \in \arg\min_{\xi\in\Xi}\{\lambda^* d^p(\xi,\widehat{\xi}^i) - \Psi(\xi)\}$. In fact, Corollary 1(ii) proves a stronger statement that there exists a worst-case distribution such that all p^i are equal, but here we allow them to vary in order to obtain a worst-case distribution with a different form. Given $\xi^{i\pm}$ for all i and by the assumption on Ξ, the problem

$$\max_{0\le p^i\le 1}\Big\{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N p^i(\Psi(\underline{\xi}^i)-\Psi(\widehat{\xi}^i)) + (1-p^i)(\Psi(\overline{\xi}^i)-\Psi(\widehat{\xi}^i)) : \\ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N p^i d^p(\underline{\xi}^i,\widehat{\xi}^i) + (1-p^i)d^p(\overline{\xi}^i,\widehat{\xi}^i) \le \theta^p\Big\}$$

is a linear program and has an optimal solution which has at most one fractional point. Thus there exists a worst-case distribution which is supported on at most $N+1$ points, and has the form (31).

To prove (iv), note that by assumption on Ψ we have $\kappa = \limsup_{d(\xi,\zeta_0)\to\infty} \frac{\Psi(\xi)-\Psi(\zeta_0)}{d^p(\xi,\zeta_0)} \le \limsup_{d(\xi,\zeta_0)\to\infty} \frac{\Psi(\xi)-\Psi(\zeta_0)}{d(\xi,\zeta_0)} \le L < \infty$. Using (i) and the proof above, let

$$\mu_\epsilon = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i\neq i_0} \delta_{\xi^i_\epsilon} + \frac{p_\epsilon}{N}\delta_{\underline{\xi}^{i_0}_\epsilon} + \frac{1-p_\epsilon}{N}\delta_{\overline{\xi}^{i_0}_\epsilon},$$

be an ϵ-optimal solution. Then

$$\xi^{ik} = \begin{cases} \xi^i_\epsilon, & \forall\ 1\le k\le K,\ \forall\ i\neq i_0, \\ \underline{\xi}^{i_0}_\epsilon, & \forall\ 1\le k\le \lfloor Kp_\epsilon\rfloor,\ i=i_0, \\ \overline{\xi}^{i_0}_\epsilon, & \forall\ \lfloor Kp_\epsilon\rfloor < k\le N,\ i=i_0, \end{cases}$$

belongs to $\mathfrak{M}_K$. For any $\lambda_1 \ge \kappa$ such that $\Phi(\lambda_1,\zeta)$ is finite, and for any $\lambda > \lambda_1$, by Lemma 3(i) we have

$$\frac{\lambda-\lambda_1}{2} d^p(\underline{\xi}^{i_0}_\epsilon, \widehat{\xi}^{i_0}) \le \frac{\lambda-\lambda_1}{2} d^p(\overline{\xi}^{i_0}_\epsilon, \widehat{\xi}^{i_0}) \le \Phi(\lambda, \widehat{\xi}^{i_0}) - \Phi(\lambda_1, \widehat{\xi}^1) + C d^p(\widehat{\xi}^{i_0}, \widehat{\xi}^1),$$

hence there exists $D \ge 0$, independent of $\overline{\xi}^{i_0}_\epsilon$, such that $d^p(\underline{\xi}^{i_0}_\epsilon, \widehat{\xi}^{i_0}) \le d^p(\overline{\xi}^{i_0}_\epsilon, \widehat{\xi}^{i_0}) \le D$. Since $\left|p_\epsilon - \lfloor Kp_\epsilon\rfloor/K\right| < 1/K$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left|v_K - \mathbb{E}_{\mu_\epsilon}[\Psi(\xi)]\right| &\le \frac{1}{N}\left|p_\epsilon - \lfloor Kp_\epsilon\rfloor/K\right| \cdot \left(\Psi(\underline{\xi}^{i_0}_\epsilon) - \Psi(\overline{\xi}^{i_0}_\epsilon)\right) \\ &\le \frac{1}{NK}\left(\Psi(\underline{\xi}^{i_0}_\epsilon) - \Psi(\widehat{\xi}^{i_0})\right) \\ &\le \frac{M + L d(\underline{\xi}^{i_0}_\epsilon, \widehat{\xi}^{i_0})}{NK} \\ &\le \frac{M + LD}{NK}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\epsilon \to 0$ we obtain the results. □

Example 5 (Saddle-point Problem). When $\Psi(x,\xi)$ is convex in x and concave ξ, $p=1$, and $d = ||\cdot||_2$, Corollary 2(iv) shows that the DRSO (1) is equivalent to a convex-concave saddle point problem

$$\min_{x\in X} \max_{(\xi^1,\ldots,\xi^N)\in Y} \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \Psi(x,\xi^i), \tag{34}$$

with ℓ_1/ℓ_2-norm uncertainty set

$$Y = \left\{(\xi^1,\ldots,\xi^N) \in \Xi^N : \sum_{i=1}^N ||\xi^i - \widehat{\xi}^i||_2 \le N\theta\right\}.$$

Therefore it can be solved by the Mirror-Prox algorithm (Nemirovski [37], Nesterov and Nemirovski [38]).

Example 6 (Piecewise concave objective). Esfahani and Kuhn [22] proves that when $p=1$, Ξ is a convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^s$ equipped with some norm $||\cdot||$ and $\Psi(\xi) = \max_{1\le j\le J}\Psi^j(\xi)$, where Ψ^j are concave, the DRSO is equivalent to a convex program. We here show that it can be obtained as a corollary from the structure of the worst-case distribution. Indeed, using Corollary 2(i), for every i, there exists $p_{ij}\ge 0$ and $\xi^{ij}\in\Xi$, $j=1,\ldots,J$, such that $\sum_{j=1}^J p_{ij} = 1$ with at most two non-zero p_{ij}, and

$$p\Psi(\underline{\xi}^i) + (1-p)\Psi(\overline{\xi}^i) = \sum_{j=1}^J p_{ij}\Psi_j(\xi^{ij}).$$

So without decreasing the optimal value we can restrict the set $\mathfrak{M}$ to a smaller set:

$$\sup_{p_{ij}\geq 0,\xi^{ij}\in\Xi}\left\{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{J}p_{ij}\Psi(\xi^{ij}):\ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{J}p_{ij}d(\xi^{ij},\widehat{\xi}^{i})\leq\theta,\ \sum_{j=1}^{J}p_{ij}=1,\forall i\right\}.$$

Replacing ξ^{ij} by $\widehat{\xi}^{i}+(\xi^{ij}-\widehat{\xi}^{i})/p_{ij}$, by positive homogeneity of norms and convexity-preserving property of perspective functions (cf. Section 2.3.3 in Boyd and Vandenberghe [14]), we obtain an equivalent convex program reformulation of (8):

$$\sup_{\substack{p_{ij}\geq 0,\sum_j p_{ij}=1\\ \xi^{ij}\in\mathbb{R}^s}}\left\{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{J}p_{ij}\Psi^{j}\left(\widehat{\xi}^{i}+\frac{\xi^{ij}-\widehat{\xi}^{i}}{p_{ij}}\right):\ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{J}d(\xi^{ij},\widehat{\xi}^{i})\leq\theta,\ \widehat{\xi}^{i}+\frac{\xi^{ij}-\widehat{\xi}^{i}}{p_{ij}}\in\Xi,\forall i,j\right\}.$$

So we recover Theorem 4.5 in Esfahani and Kuhn [22], which was obtained therein by a separate procedure of dualizing twice the reformulation (28).

EXAMPLE 7 (**Uncertainty Quantification**). When $\Xi=\mathbb{R}^s$ and $\Psi=\mathbb{1}_C$, where C is an open set, the worst-case distribution μ^* of the problem

$$\min_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}}\mu(C)$$

has a clear interpretation. Indeed, using the notation in Theorem 1(ii), for any $\zeta\in\operatorname{supp}\nu$, we have $\overline{T}^*(\zeta),\underline{T}^*(\zeta)\in\{\zeta\}\cup\arg\min_{\xi\in\partial C}d^p(\xi,\zeta)$, namely, μ^* either keeps ζ still, or perturbs it to the closest point on the boundary (so $\mathbb{1}_C(\zeta)$ changes from 1 to 0). Since μ^* transports as much mass in C outwards as possible, it transports mass in a *greedy* fashion. Suppose $\{\widehat{\xi}^{i}\}_{i=1}^{N}$ are sorted such that $\widehat{\xi}^{1},\ldots,\widehat{\xi}^{i}\in C$, $\widehat{\xi}^{I+1},\ldots,\widehat{\xi}^{N}\notin C$ and satisfy $d(\widehat{\xi}^{1},\Xi\setminus C)\leq\cdots\leq d(\widehat{\xi}^{i},\Xi\setminus C)$. Then $\widehat{\xi}^{I+1},\ldots,\widehat{\xi}^{N}$ stay the same, and $\widehat{\xi}^{i}$ with small index has the priority to be transported to ∂C. It may happen that some point $\widehat{\xi}^{i_0}$ $(i_0\leq I)$ cannot be transported to ∂C with full mass $\frac{1}{N}$, since otherwise the Wasserstein distance constraint is violated. In this case, only partial mass is transported and the remaining stays (see Figure 3). Therefore the worst-case distribution has the form

$$\mu^*=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1}\delta_{\xi_*^i}+\frac{p_0}{N}\delta_{\widehat{\xi}^{i_0}}+\frac{1-p_0}{N}\delta_{\xi_*^{i_0}}+\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=i_0+1}^{N}\delta_{\widehat{\xi}^{i}},\tag{35}$$

where $\xi_*^i\in\arg\min_{\xi\in\partial C}d(\xi,\widehat{\xi}^{i})$ for all $i\leq i_0=\min\left(N,\min\{i\geq I+1:\sum_{i=I+1}^{i_0}d^p(\widehat{\xi}^{i},\Xi\setminus C)\geq N\theta^p\}\right)$.



FIGURE 3. When $\Psi=\mathbb{1}_C$, the worst-case distribution perturbs the nominal distribution in a greedy fashion. The solid and diamond dots are the support of nominal distribution ν. $\widehat{\xi}^{1},\widehat{\xi}^{2},\widehat{\xi}^{3}$ are three closest interior points to ∂C and thus are transported to ξ_*^1,ξ_*^2,ξ_*^3 respectively. $\widehat{\xi}^{4}$ is the fourth closest interior point to ∂C, but cannot be transported to ∂C as full mass due to Wasserstein distance constraint, so it is split into $\overline{\xi}_*^4$ and $\underline{\xi}_*^4$.

Using the similar idea as above, we can prove that the worst-case probability is continuous with respect to the boundary.

PROPOSITION 4 **(Continuity with respect to the boundary).** *Let $\Xi = \mathbb{R}^s$, $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)$, $\theta \geq 0$, and $\mathfrak{M} = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi) : W_p(\mu, \nu) \leq \theta\}$. Then for any Borel set $C \subset \Xi$,*

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \mu(C) \quad = \quad \min_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \mu(\text{int}(C)).$$

The result is quite intuitive. In fact, when C is not open and ∂C is non-empty, transporting mass to ∂C may not change the objective from 1 to 0 as when C is open. Instead, one can transport it to the point outside C but arbitrarily close to ∂C. This explains why the worst-case probability is continuous with respect to ∂C.

COROLLARY 3 **(Affinely-perturbed objective).** *Suppose $\Psi(x, \xi) = a^\top x + b$, where $\xi = [a; b]$. Assume the metric d is induced by some norm $||\cdot||_q$. Let $\nu = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\widehat{\xi}^i}$ and $\widehat{\xi}^i = [\hat{a}_i; \hat{b}_i]$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$. Then the DRSO problem (1) is equivalent to*

$$\min_{x \in X, t \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ t : \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{a}_i^\top x + \hat{b}_i) + \theta ||x||_{q^*} \leq t \right\},$$

where q^* is such that $1/q + 1/q^* = 1$.

Now let us consider a special case when $\Xi = \{\xi^0, \ldots, \xi^{\bar{B}}\}$ for some positive integer $\bar{B}$. In this case, let N_i be the samples that are equal to ξ^i, and let $q_i = N_i/N$, $i = 0, \ldots, \bar{B}$, then the nominal distribution $\nu = \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{B}} q_i \delta_{\xi^i}$. Let $\boldsymbol{q} := (q_0, \ldots, q_{\bar{B}})^\top \in \Delta_{\bar{B}}$. The DRSO becomes

$$\min_{x \in X} \max_{\boldsymbol{p} \in \Delta_{\bar{B}}} \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{\bar{B}} p_i \Psi(x, \xi^i) : W_p(\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}) \leq \theta \right\}. \tag{36}$$

COROLLARY 4. *Problem (36) has a strong dual*

$$\min_{x \in X, \lambda \geq 0} \left\{ \lambda\theta^p + \sum_{i=0}^{\bar{B}} q_i y_i : \; y_i \geq \Psi(x, \xi^j) - \lambda d^p(\xi^i, \xi^j), \; \forall i, j = 1, \ldots, \bar{B} \right\}. \tag{37}$$

For any x, the worst-case distribution can be computed by

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{p} \in \Delta_{\bar{B}}, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\bar{B} \times \bar{B}}} \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{\bar{B}} p_i \Psi(x, \xi^i) : \; \sum_{i,j} d^p(\xi^i, \xi^j)\gamma_{ij} \leq \theta^p, \; \sum_j \gamma_{ij} = p_i, \forall i, \; \sum_i \gamma_{ij} = q_j, \forall j \right\}. \tag{38}$$

Proof. Reformulation (37) follows from Theorem 1, and (38) can be obtained using the equivalent definition of Wasserstein distance in Example 2. □

4. Applications. In this section, we apply our results to point process control and worst-case Value-at-Risk analysis. Both are important classes of applications for which we can use our results, but for which the results in Esfahani and Kuhn [22] and Zhao and Guan [57] cannot be applied because the nominal distributions violate their assumptions.

4.1. On/Off Process Control. We consider a distributionally robust process control problem in which the nominal distribution ν is a point process. The space Ξ of point process sample paths is infinite dimensional and non-convex, which violates the assumptions in Esfahani and Kuhn [22] and Zhao and Guan [57].

In the problem, the decision maker faces a point process and controls a two-state (on/off) system. The point process is assumed to be exogenous, that is, the arrival times are not affected by the on/off state of the system. When the system is switched on, a cost of c per unit time is incurred,

and each arrival while the system is on contributes 1 unit revenue. When the system is off, no cost is incurred and no revenue is earned. The decision maker wants to choose a control to maximize the total profit during a finite time horizon. This problem is a prototype for problems in sensor network and revenue management.

In many practical settings, the decision maker does not have a probability distribution for the point process. Instead, the decision maker has observations of historical sample paths of the point process, which constitute an empirical point process. Note that if one would use the Sample Average Approximation (SAA) method with the empirical point process, it would yield a degenerate control, in which the system is switched on only at the arrival time points of the empirical point process. Consequently, if future arrival times can differ from the empirical arrival times by even a little bit, the system would be switched off and no revenue would be earned. Due to such degeneracy and instability of the SAA method, we resort to the distributionally robust approach.

We consider the following problem. We scale the finite time horizon to $[0,1]$. Let $\Xi = \{\sum_{t=1}^{m} \delta_{\xi_t} : m \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \xi_t \in [0,1], t = 1,\ldots,m\}$ be the space of finite counting measures on $[0,1]$. We note that in this subsection, when we write the W_1 distance between two Borel measures, we use the extended definition mentioned in Section 2. We assume that the metric d on Ξ satisfies the following conditions:

1) For any $\hat{\eta} = \sum_{t=1}^{m} \delta_{\zeta_t}$ and $\eta = \sum_{t=1}^{m} \delta_{\xi_t}$, where m is a nonnegative integer and $\{\zeta_t\}_{t=1}^{m}, \{\xi_t\}_{t=1}^{m} \subset [0,1]$, it holds that
$$d(\eta,\hat{\eta}) \;=\; W_1(\eta,\hat{\eta}) \;=\; \sum_{t=1}^{m} |\xi_{(t)} - \zeta_{(t)}|, \tag{39}$$
where $\xi_{(t)}$ (resp. $\zeta_{(\tau)}$) are the order statistics of ξ_t (resp. $\zeta_{(\tau)}$).
2) For any Borel set $C \subset [0,1]$, $\bar{\theta} \geq 0$, and $\hat{\eta} = \sum_{t=1}^{m} \delta_{\zeta_t}$, where m is a positive integer and $\{\zeta_t\}_{t=1}^{m} \subset [0,1]$, it holds that
$$\inf_{\eta \in \Xi} \left\{\eta(C) : \; d(\eta,\hat{\eta}) = \bar{\theta}\right\} \geq \inf_{\tilde{\eta} \in \mathcal{B}([0,1])} \left\{\tilde{\eta}(C) : W_1(\tilde{\eta},\hat{\eta}) \leq \bar{\theta}\right\}. \tag{40}$$
3) The metric space (Ξ, d) is a complete and separable metric space.

We note that condition (39) is only imposed on $\eta, \hat{\eta} \in \Xi$ such that $\eta([0,1]) = \hat{\eta}([0,1])$. Possible choices for d are
$$d\Big(\sum_{t=1}^{l} \delta_{\xi_t}, \sum_{\tau=1}^{m} \delta_{\zeta_\tau}\Big) \;=\; \sum_{t=1}^{\min\{m,l\}} \left|\xi_{(t)} - \zeta_{(t)}\right| + |m-l|,$$
or
$$d\Big(\sum_{t=1}^{l} \delta_{\xi_t}, \sum_{\tau=1}^{m} \delta_{\zeta_\tau}\Big) \;=\; \begin{cases} \max\{m,l\}, & l \neq m, \\ \sum_{t=1}^{m} \left|\xi_{(t)} - \zeta_{(t)}\right|, & l = m. \end{cases}$$
This metric is similar to the ones in Barbour and Brown [4] and Chen and Xia [17].

Given the metric d, the point processes on $[0,1]$ are then defined by the set $\mathcal{P}(\Xi)$ of Borel probability measures on Ξ. For simplicity, we choose the distance between two point processes $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)$ to be $W_1(\mu,\nu)$ as defined in (5). Suppose we have N sample paths $\hat{\eta}^i = \sum_{t=1}^{m_i} \delta_{\widehat{\xi}_t^i}$, $i = 1,\ldots,N$, where m_i is a nonnegative integer and $\widehat{\xi}_t^i \in [0,1]$ for all i,t. Then the nominal distribution $\nu = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta_{\hat{\eta}^i}$, and the ambiguity set $\mathfrak{M} = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi) : W_1(\mu,\nu) \leq \theta\}$. Let X denote the set of all functions $x : [0,1] \to \{0,1\}$ such that $x^{-1}(1)$ is a Borel set, where $x^{-1}(1) := \{t \in [0,1] : x(t) = 1\}$. The decision maker is looking for a control $x \in X$ that maximizes the total profit, by solving the problem
$$v^* \;:=\; \sup_{x \in X} \left\{v(x) \;:=\; -c\int_0^1 x(t)dt + \inf_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{E}_{\eta \sim \mu}\left[\eta(x^{-1}(1))\right]\right\}. \tag{41}$$

We now investigate the structure of the optimal control. Let $\mathrm{int}(x^{-1}(1))$ be the interior of the set $x^{-1}(1)$ on the space $[0,1]$ with canonical topology (and thus $0,1 \in \mathrm{int}([0,1])$).

PROPOSITION 5. *For any $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)$ and control x, it holds that*

$$\inf_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\mu}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))] \;=\; \inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}([0,1])\times\Xi)} \Big\{\mathbb{E}_{(\eta,\hat\eta)\sim\rho}[\eta(\mathrm{int}(x^{-1}(1)))]:\ \mathbb{E}_{(\eta,\hat\eta)\sim\rho}\big[W_1(\eta,\hat\eta)\big]\le\theta,\ \pi^2_{\#}\rho=\nu\Big\}, \tag{42}$$

Suppose $\nu = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\hat\eta^i}$ with $\hat\eta^i = \sum_{t=1}^{m_i}\delta_{\widehat{\xi}^i_t}$. There exists a non-negative integer M such that

$$v^* = \sup_{\substack{\underline{x}_j,\overline{x}_j\in[0,1],\\ \underline{x}_j<\overline{x}_j<\underline{x}_{j'}<\overline{x}_{j'},\forall 1\le j<j'\le M}} \Big\{v\big(\sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{1}_{[\underline{x}_j,\overline{x}_j]}\big) := -c\sum_{j=1}^M(\overline{x}_j-\underline{x}_j) + \inf_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}}\mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\mu}\big[\eta\{\cup_{j=1}^M[\underline{x}_j,\overline{x}_j]\}\big]\Big\}. \tag{43}$$

Note that

$$\inf_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))] = \inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{P}(\Xi^2)} \big\{\mathbb{E}_{(\eta,\hat\eta)\sim\gamma}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))]:\ \mathbb{E}_{\gamma}[d(\eta,\hat\eta)]\le\theta,\ \pi^2_{\#}\gamma=\nu\big\}.$$

Hence (42) shows that without changing the optimal value, we can replace d by W_1 in the constraint, and enlarge the set of joint distributions from $\mathcal{P}(\Xi^2)$ to $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}([0,1])\times\Xi)$. Moreover, (43) shows that it suffices to consider the set of polices of which the duration of on-state is a finite disjoint union of intervals with positive length. We next show that given a control $\sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{1}_{[\underline{x}_j,\overline{x}_j]}$, the computation of worst-case point process reduces to a linear program. For every $1\le i\le N$ and $1\le t\le m_i$, if $\widehat{\xi}^i_t \in \cup_{j=1}^M[\underline{x}_j,\overline{x}_j]$, we set $j^i_t\in\{1,\dots,M\}$ to be such that $\widehat{\xi}^i_t\in[\underline{x}_{j^i_t},\overline{x}_{j^i_t}]$, otherwise $j^i_t=0$. We also set x_0 to be any real number.

PROPOSITION 6. *Let $v\big(\sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{1}_{[\underline{x}_j,\overline{x}_j]}\big)$ be defined in (43). It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} v\big(\sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{1}_{[\underline{x}_j,\overline{x}_j]}\big) =& \sum_{j=1}^M -c(\overline{x}_j-\underline{x}_j) + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{[\underline{x}_j,\overline{x}_j]}(\widehat{\xi}^i_t) \\ &+ \min_{\substack{\underline{p}^i_t,\overline{p}^i_t\ge 0\\ \underline{p}^i_t+\overline{p}^i_t\le 1}} \Big\{-\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{1\le t\le m_i: j^i_t>0}(\underline{p}^i_t+\overline{p}^i_t) : \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{1\le t\le m_i: j^i_t>0}\big(\underline{p}^i_t|\underline{x}_{j^i_t}-\widehat{\xi}^i_t| + \overline{p}^i_t|\overline{x}_{j^i_t}-\widehat{\xi}^i_t|\big)\le\theta\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the above linear program can be solved by a greedy algorithm (see Algorithm 1), and there exists a worst-case point process that has the form

$$\mu^*(x) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq i_0}}^N \delta_{\eta^i_*} + \frac{p_0}{N}\delta_{\underline{\eta}^{i_0}_*} + \frac{(1-p_0)}{N}\delta_{\overline{\eta}^{i_0}_*},$$

where $i_0\in\{1,\dots,N\}$, $\eta^i_*,\in\Xi$, $\eta^i_*([0,1])=\hat\eta^i([0,1])$ for all $i\neq i_0$, $\underline{\eta}^{i_0}_*,\overline{\eta}^{i_0}_*\in\Xi$ and $\underline{\eta}^{i_0}_*([0,1]) = \overline{\eta}^{i_0}_*([0,1]) = \hat\eta^{i_0}([0,1])$.

EXAMPLE 8. We illustrate our results with a preliminary numerical tests as follows. Suppose the number of arrivals has Poisson distribution $Poisson(\lambda)$, and given the number of arrivals, the arrival times are i.i.d. with density $f(t)$, $t\in[0,1]$. Then problem (41) is $\max_x\int_{x^{-1}(1)}[-c+\lambda f(t)]dt$, with optimal control $x^*(t)=1_{\{\lambda f(t)>c\}}$. Note that $f\equiv 1$ corresponds to the Poisson point process with rate λ. In this example, we instead consider $f(t)=k[a+\sin(wt+s)]$, with $a>1$ and $k=1/[a+(\cos(s)-\cos(w+s))/w]$. Particularly, let $w=5\pi$, $s=\frac{5}{2}\pi$, $a=1.1$ and $c=\lambda=10$. Thus $x^{*-1}(1)=[0,0.1]\cup[0.3,0.5]\cup[0.7,0.9]$. In the numerical experiment, suppose we have $N=10$ sample paths, each of which contains $m_i\sim Poisson(\lambda)$, $i=1,\dots,N$, i.i.d. arrival time points. The optimal controls for the true process and the DRSO are shown in Figure 4. We observe that even with a relatively small number of samples, the two controls differ from each other not too much, and thus the DRSO indeed provides a good solution to the original process control problem.

Algorithm 1 Greedy Algorithm

$\bar{\theta} \leftarrow 0$. $k \leftarrow 1$. $\overline{p}_t^i, \underline{p}_t^i \leftarrow 0$, $d_t^i \leftarrow \min(|\underline{x}_{j_t^i} - \widehat{\xi}_t^i|, |\overline{x}_{j_t^i} - \widehat{\xi}_t^i|)$, $\forall i, t$.

Sort $\{d_t^i\}_{1\le i\le N, 1\le t\le m_i}$ in increasing order, denoted by $d_{t_{(1)}^{i_{(1)}}} \le d_{t_{(2)}^{i_{(2)}}} \le \ldots \le d_{t_{(\sum_{i=1}^N m_i)}^{i_{(\sum_{i=1}^N m_i)}}}$.

while $\bar{\theta} < N\theta$ **do**

  if $d_t^i = |\underline{x}_{j_t^i} - \widehat{\xi}_t^i|$ **then** $\underline{p}_{t_{(k)}^{i_{(k)}}}^{i_{(k)}*} \leftarrow \min\left(1, (N\theta - \bar{\theta})/d_{t_{(k)}^{i_{(k)}}}^{i_{(k)}}\right)$.

  else $\overline{p}_{t_{(k)}^{i_{(k)}}}^{i_{(k)}*} \leftarrow \min\left(1, (N\theta - \bar{\theta})/d_{t_{(k)}^{i_{(k)}}}^{i_{(k)}}\right)$.

  end if

  $k \leftarrow k + 1$.

end while



FIGURE 4. Optimal control for the true process and the DRSO

4.2. Worst-case Value-at-Risk. In this subsection we study worst-case Value-at-Risk analysis, where the nominal distribution can be any probability distributions on $\mathbb{R}^s$.

Value-at-risk is a popular risk measure in financial industry. Given a random variable Z and $\alpha \in (0,1)$, the value-at-risk $\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[Z]$ of Z with respect to measure ν is defined by

$$\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[Z] := \inf\{t : \mathbb{P}_\nu\{Z \le t\} \ge 1 - \alpha\}. \tag{44}$$

In the spirit of El Ghaoui et al. [20], we consider the following worst-case VaR problem. Suppose we are given a portfolio consisting of n assets with allocation weight w satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^N w_i = 1$ and $w \ge 0$. Let ξ_i be the (random) return rate of asset i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, and $r = \mathbb{E}[\xi]$ the vector of the expected return rates. Assume the metric d is induced by the infinity norm $||\cdot||_\infty$ on $\mathbb{R}^s$. The worst-case VaR with respect to the set of probability distributions $\mathfrak{M}$ is defined as

$$\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha^{wc}(w) := \min_q \left\{ q : \inf_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{P}_\mu\{-w^\top\xi \le q\} \ge 1 - \alpha \right\}. \tag{45}$$

PROPOSITION 7. *Let* $q \ge \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi]$, $\theta > 0$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $w \in \{w' \in \mathbb{R}^N : \sum_{i=1}^N w_i' = 1,\ w' \ge 0\}$. *Define*

$$\beta_0 := \min\left(1, \frac{(\alpha - \nu\{\xi : -w^\top\xi > \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi]\})(q - \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi])^p}{\left|\theta^p - \mathbb{E}_\nu\left[(q + w^\top\xi)^p \mathbb{1}_{\{-w^\top\xi > \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi]\}}\right]\right|}\right).$$

Then

$$\inf_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{P}_\mu\{-w^\top\xi \le q\} \ge 1 - \alpha \Longleftrightarrow$$
$$\mathbb{E}_\nu\left[((q + w^\top\xi)^+)^p + \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{-w^\top\xi > \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi]\}}\right] + \beta_0 \mathbb{E}_\nu\left[((q + w^\top\xi)^+)^p \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{-w^\top\xi = \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi]\}}\right] \ge \theta^p.$$

In particular, when (i) ν is a continuous distribution,

$$\inf_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{P}_\mu\{-w^\top\xi \le q\} \ge 1-\alpha \Longleftrightarrow \mathbb{E}_\nu\left[((q+w^\top\xi)^+)^p \mathbb{1}_{\{-w^\top\xi \ge \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi]\}}\right] \ge \theta^p.$$



FIGURE 5. Worst-case VaR. When $-w^\top\xi$ is continuously distributed and $p=1$, VaR_α^{wc} equals to the q such that the area of the shade region is equal to θ.

EXAMPLE 9 (**Worst-case** VaR **with Gaussian nominal distribution**). Suppose $\nu \sim N(\bar{\mu},\Sigma)$ and consider $p=1$. It follows that $-w^\top\xi \sim N(-w^\top\bar{\mu}, w^\top\Sigma w)$ and $\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi] = -w^\top\bar{\mu} + \sqrt{w^\top\Sigma w}\Phi^{-1}(1-\alpha)$. By Proposition 7, $\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha^{wc}(-w^\top\xi)$ is the minimal q such that (see Figure 5)

$$f(q) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi w^\top\Sigma w}} \int_{\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi]}^{q} (q-y) e^{-\frac{(y+w^\top\bar{\mu})^2}{2w^\top\Sigma w}} dy \ge \theta. \tag{46}$$

Since $f(q)$ is monotone, (46) can be solved efficiently via any one-dimensional search algorithm.

5. Discussions. In this section, we discuss some advantages of Wasserstein ambiguity set. In Section 5.1, we compare the Wasserstein ambiguity set to ϕ-divergence ambiguity set for newsvendor problem. In Section 5.2, we illustrate how the close connection between DRSO and robust programming (Corollary 4(iv)) can expand the tractability of DRSOs. Finally in Section 5.3, we demonstrate the power of our constructive proof method by applying it to a class of distributionally robust transportation problems other than DRSOs.

5.1. Newsvendor problem: a comparison to ϕ-divergence. In this subsection, we discuss some advantages of Wasserstein ambiguity set by performing a numerical study on distributionally robust newsvendor problems, with an emphasis on the worst-case distribution.

In the newsvendor model, the decision maker has to decide the inventory level before the random demand is realized, facing both overage and underage costs. The problem can be formulated as

$$\min_{x\ge 0} \mathbb{E}_\mu[h(x-\xi)^+ + b(\xi-x)^+],$$

where x is the decision variable for initial inventory level, ξ is the random demand, and h, b represent respectively the overage and underage costs per unit. We assume that $b, h > 0$, and ξ is supported on $\{0,1,\ldots,\bar{B}\}$ for some positive integer $\bar{B}$. Sometimes the demand data is expensive to obtain. For instance, a company is introducing a new product of which the demand data is collected by setting up pilot stores. Then the decision maker may want to consider the DRSO counterpart

$$\min_{x\ge 0} \sup_{\boldsymbol{p}\in\Delta_{\bar{B}}} \left\{\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{p}}[h(x-\xi)^+ + b(\xi-x)^+] : W_p(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}) \le \theta\right\}. \tag{47}$$

Using Corollary 4, we obtain a convex programming reformulation of (47)

$$\min_{x,\lambda\ge 0} \left\{\lambda\theta^p + \sum_{i=0}^{\bar{B}} q_i y_i : \; y_i \ge \max\left[h(x-j), b(j-x)\right] - \lambda|i-j|^p, \; \forall 0\le i,j\le \bar{B}\right\}. \tag{48}$$

TABLE 1. Examples of ϕ-divergence

Divergence	Kullback-Leibler	Burg entropy	χ^2-distance	Modified χ^2	Hellinger	Total Variation
ϕ	ϕ_{kl}	ϕ_b	ϕ_{χ^2}	$\phi_{m\chi^2}$	ϕ_h	ϕ_{tv}
$\phi(t), t \geq 0$	$t \log t$	$-\log t$	$\frac{1}{t}(t-1)^2$	$(t-1)^2$	$(\sqrt{t}-1)^2$	$\lvert t-1 \rvert$
$I_\phi(\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q})$	$\sum p_j \log\left(\frac{p_j}{q_j}\right)$	$\sum q_j \log\left(\frac{q_j}{p_j}\right)$	$\sum \frac{(p_j-q_j)^2}{p_j}$	$\sum \frac{(p_j-q_j)^2}{q_j}$	$\sum(\sqrt{p_j}-\sqrt{q_j})^2$	$\sum \lvert p_j - q_j \rvert$

On the other hand, one may would also consider ϕ-divergence ambiguity set (Table 1 shows some common ϕ-divergences). As mentioned in Section 1, the worst-case distribution in ϕ-divergence ambiguity set may be problematic. Indeed, when $\lim_{t\to\infty} \phi(t)/t = \infty$, such as ϕ_{kl}, $\phi_{m\chi^2}$, the ϕ-divergence ambiguity set fails to include sufficiently many relevant distributions. In fact, since $0\phi(p_j/0) = p_j \lim_{t\to\infty} \phi(t)/t = \infty$ for all $p_j > 0$, the ϕ-divergence ambiguity set does not include any distribution which is not *absolutely continuous* with respect to the nominal distribution $\boldsymbol{q}$.

When $\lim_{t\to\infty} \phi(t)/t < \infty$, such as ϕ_b, ϕ_{χ^2}, ϕ_h, ϕ_{tv}, the situation is even worse. Define $I_0 := \{1 \leq j \leq N : q_j > 0\}$ and $j_M := \arg\max_{1\leq j\leq N}\{\Psi(\xi^j) : q_j = 0\}$. Assume $\Psi(\xi^j)$ are different from each other, then according to Ben-Tal et al. [8] and Bayraksan and Love [6], the worst-case distribution satisfies

$$p_j^*/q_j \in \partial\phi^*\Big(\frac{\Psi(\xi^j)-\beta^*}{\lambda^*}\Big), \ \forall i \in I_0, \tag{49a}$$

$$p_j^* = 0, \ \forall j \notin I_0 \cup \{j_M\}, \tag{49b}$$

$$p_{j_M}^* = \begin{cases} 1 - \sum_{i\in I_0} p_j^*, & \text{if } \beta^* = \Psi(\xi^{j_M}) - \lambda^* \lim_{t\to\infty} \phi(t)/t, \\ 0, & \text{if } \beta^* > \Psi(\xi^{j_M}) - \lambda^* \lim_{t\to\infty} \phi(t)/t, \end{cases} \tag{49c}$$

for some $\lambda^* \geq 0$ and $\beta^* \geq \Psi(\xi^{j_M}) - \lambda^* \lim_{t\to\infty} \phi(t)/t$. (49b) suggests that the support of the worst-case distribution and that of the nominal distribution can differ by at most one point ξ^{j_M}. If $p_{j_M}^* > 0$, (49c) suggests that the probability mass is moved away from scenarios in I_0 to the worst scenario ξ^{j_M}. Note that in many applications where the support of ξ is unknown, the choice of the underlying space Ξ (and thus ξ^{j_M}) may be arbitrary. Hence the worst-case behavior is sensitive to the specification of Ξ and the shape of function Ψ.

We perform a numerical test of which setup is similar to Wang et al. [55] and Ben-Tal et al. [8]. We set $b = h = 1$, $\bar{B} = 100$, and $N \in \{50, 500\}$ representing small and large datasets. The data is then generated from $Binomial(100, 0.5)$ and $Geometric(0.1)$ truncated on $[0, 100]$. For a fair comparison, we estimate the radius of the ambiguity set such that it covers the underlying distribution with probability greater than 95%.

When the underlying distribution is Binomial, intuitively, the symmetry of Binomial distribution and $b = h = 1$ implies that the optimal initial inventory level is close to $\bar{B}/2 = 50$, and the corresponding worst-case distribution should be similar to a mixture distribution with two modes, representing high and low demand respectively. This intuition is consistent with the solid curves in Figure (6a)(6b), representing the worst-case distribution in Wasserstein ambiguity set. In addition, their tail distributions are smooth and reasonable for both small and large datasets. In contrast, if Burg entropy is used to define the ambiguity set (dashed curves in Figure (6a)(6b)), the worst-case distribution has disconnected support, and is not symmetric. There is a large spike on the boundary 100, corresponding to the "popping" behavior mentioned in Bayraksan and Love [6]. Especially when the dataset is small, the spike is huge, which makes the solution too conservative.

When the underlying distribution is Geometric, intuitively, the worst-case distribution should have one spike for low demand and a heavy tail for high demand. Again, this is consistent with the worst-case distribution in Wasserstein ambiguity set (solid curves in Figure (6c)(6d)). While using Burg entropy (dashed curves in Figure (6c)(6d)), the tail has unrealistic spikes on the boundary. For distribution with unbounded support, the tail distribution is very sensitive to our choice of truncation threshold $\bar{B}$. Hence, the conclusion for this numerical test is that Wasserstein ambiguity set is likely to yield a more reasonable, robust and realistic worst-case distribution.



(a) $Binomial(200, 0.5)$, $N = 500$ (b) $Binomial(200, 0.5)$, $N = 50$

(c) truncated $Geometric(0.1)$, $N = 500$ (d) truncated $Geometric(0.1)$, $N = 50$

FIGURE 6. Histograms of worst-case distributions yielding from Wasserstein distance and Burg entropy

5.2. Two-stage DRSO: connection with robust optimization. In Corollary 2(iv) we established the close connection between the DRSO problem and robust programming. More specifically, we show that every DRSO problem can be approximated by robust programs with rather high accuracy, which significantly enlarges the applicability of the DRSO problem. To illustrate this point, in this section we show the tractability of the two-stage linear DRSOs.

Consider the two-stage distributionally robust stochastic optimization

$$\min_{x\in X} c^\top x + \sup_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{E}_\mu[\Psi(x,\xi)], \tag{50}$$

where $\Psi(x,\xi)$ is the optimal value of the second-stage problem

$$\min_{y\in\mathbb{R}^m} \left\{ q(\xi)^\top y : T(\xi)x + W(\xi)y \le h(\xi) \right\}, \tag{51}$$

and

$$q(\xi) = q^0 + \sum_{l=1}^s \xi_l q^l,\ T(\xi) = T^0 + \sum_{l=1}^s \xi_l T^l,\ W(\xi) = W^0 + \sum_{l=1}^s \xi_l W^l,\ h(\xi) = h^0 + \sum_{l=1}^s \xi_l h^l.$$

We assume $p = 2$ and $\Xi = \mathbb{R}^s$ with Euclidean distance d. In general, the two-stage problem (50) is NP-hard. However, we are going to show that with tools from robust programming, we are able to

obtain a tractable approximation of (50). Let $\mathfrak{M}_1 := \{(\xi^1,\ldots,\xi^N) \in \Xi^N : \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N ||\xi^i - \widehat{\xi}^i||_2^2 \le \theta^2\}$. Using Theorem 2(iii) with $K=1$, we obtain an adjustable-robust-programming approximation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min_{x\in X}\Big\{c^\top x + \sup_{(\xi^i)_i\in\mathfrak{M}_1}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \Psi(x,\xi^i)\Big\}\\
&= \min_{\substack{x\in X, t\in\mathbb{R}\\ y:\Xi\to\mathbb{R}}}\left\{t:\ \begin{array}{l} t\ge c^\top x + \frac{1}{N}\sum_i q(\xi^i)^\top y(\xi^i),\ \forall (\xi^i)_i\in\mathfrak{M}_1,\\ T(\xi)x + W(\xi)y(\xi)\le h(\xi),\ \forall \xi\in\bigcup_{i=1}^N\{\xi'\in\Xi : ||\xi'-\widehat{\xi}^i||_2\le\theta\sqrt{N}\}\end{array}\right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

where the second set of inequalities follows from the fact that $T(\xi)x + W(\xi)y(\xi)\le h(\xi)$ should hold for any realization ξ with positive probability for some distribution in $\mathfrak{M}_1$. Although problem (52) is still intractable in general, there has been a substantial literature on different approximations to problem (52). One popular approach is to consider the so-called affinely adjustable robust counterpart (AARC) as follows. We assume that y is an affine function of ξ:

$$y(\xi) = y^0 + \sum_{l=1}^s \xi_l y^l,\ \forall \xi\in\bigcup_{i=1}^N B^i,$$

for some $y^0, y^l\in\mathbb{R}^m$, where $B^i := \{\xi'\in\Xi : ||\xi'-\widehat{\xi}^i||_2\le\theta\sqrt{N}\}$. Then the AARC of (52) is

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{\substack{x\in X,t\in\mathbb{R}\\ y^l\in\mathbb{R}^m, l=0,\ldots,s}}\Bigg\{&t:\ c^\top x + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N\Big(q^0+\sum_{l=1}^s\xi_l^i q^l\Big)^\top\Big(y^0+\sum_{l=1}^s\xi_l^i y^l\Big) - t\le 0,\ \forall(\xi^i)_i\in\mathfrak{M}_1,\\
&\Big(T^0+\sum_{l=1}^s\xi_l T^l\Big)x + \Big(W^0+\sum_{l=1}^s\xi_l W^l\Big)\Big(y^0+\sum_{l=1}^s\xi_l y^l\Big) - \Big(h^0+\sum_{l=1}^s h^l\xi_l\Big)\le 0,\ \forall\xi\in\bigcup_{i=1}^N B^i\Bigg\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Set $\zeta_{il} := \xi_l^i - \widehat{\xi}_l^i$ for $i=1,\ldots,N$ and $l=1,\ldots,s$. In view of $\mathfrak{M}_1$, ζ belongs to the ellipsoidal uncertainty set

$$\mathcal{U}_\zeta = \{(\zeta_{il})_{i,l} : \sum_{i,l}\zeta_{il}^2\le N\theta^2\}.$$

Set $z = [x;t;\{y^l\}_{l=0}^s]$, and define

$$\begin{cases}
\alpha_0(z) := -\Big[c^\top x + \dfrac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N(q^0+\sum_{l=1}^s\widehat{\xi}_l^i q^l)^\top(y^0+\sum_{l=1}^s\widehat{\xi}_l^i y^l) - t\Big],\\
\beta_0^{il}(z) := -\dfrac{\Big[(q^0+\sum_{l'=1}^s\widehat{\xi}_{l'}^i q^{l'})^\top y^{l'} + {q^{l'}}^\top(y^0+\sum_{l'=1}^s\widehat{\xi}_{l'}^i y^{l'})\Big]}{2N},\quad \forall 1\le i\le N,\ 1\le l,l'\le s.\\
\Gamma_0^{(l,l')}(z) := -\dfrac{q^l y^{l'} + q^{l'} y^l}{2N},
\end{cases}$$

Then the first set of constraints in (53) is equivalent to

$$\alpha_0(z) + 2\sum_{i,l}\beta_0^{il}(z)\zeta_{il} + \sum_i\sum_{l,l'}\Gamma_0^{(l,l')}\zeta_{il}\zeta_{il'}\ge 0,\quad \forall(\zeta_{il})_{i,l}\in\mathcal{U}_\zeta. \tag{54}$$

It follows from Theorem 4.2 in Ben-Tal et al. [9] that (54) takes place if and only if there exists $\lambda_0\ge 0$ such that

$$(\alpha_0(z)-\lambda_0)v^2 + 2v\sum_{i,l}\beta_0^{il}(z)w_{il} + \sum_i\sum_{l,l'}\Gamma_0^{(l,l')}w_{il}w_{i'l'} + \frac{\lambda_0}{N\theta^2}\sum_{i,l}w_{il}^2\ge 0,\quad \forall v\in\mathbb{R},\forall w_{il}\in\mathbb{R},\forall i,l.$$

Or in matrix form,

$$\exists \lambda_0 \geq 0: \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_0 \otimes I_N + \frac{\lambda_0}{N\theta^2} \cdot I_{sN} & \mathrm{vec}(\beta_0) \\ \mathrm{vec}^\top(\beta_0) & \alpha_0(z) - \lambda_0 \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0, \tag{55}$$

where I_N (resp. I_{sN}) is N (resp. sN) dimensional identity matrix, $\otimes$ is the Kronecker product of matrices and vec is the vectorization of a matrix.

Now we reformulate the second set of constraints in (53). For all $1 \leq i \leq N$, $1 \leq j \leq m$ and $1 \leq l, l' \leq s$, we set

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_{ij}(z) := -\Big[(T_j^0 + \sum_{l=1}^s \widehat{\xi}_l^i T_j^l)x + (W_j^0 + \sum_{l=1}^s \widehat{\xi}_l^i W_j^l)(y^0 + \sum_{l=1}^s \widehat{\xi}_l^i y^l) - (h_j^0 + \sum_{l=1}^s \widehat{\xi}_l^i h_j^l)\Big], \\ \beta_{ij}^l(z) := -\dfrac{\Big[T_j^l x + (W_j^0 + \sum_{l=1}^s \widehat{\xi}_l^i W_j^l)y^l + W_j^l(y^0 + \sum_{l=1}^s \widehat{\xi}_l^i y^l) - h_l\Big]}{2}, \\ \Gamma_j^{(l,l')}(z) := -\dfrac{W_j^l y^{l'} + W_j^{l'} y^l}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Let $\eta^i := \xi - \widehat{\xi}^i$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$. Then the second set of constraints in (53) is equivalent to

$$\alpha_{ij}(z) + 2\beta_{ij}(z)^\top \eta^i + {\eta^i}^\top \Gamma_j(z)\eta^i \geq 0, \quad \forall \eta^i \in \{\eta' \in \mathbb{R}^s : ||\eta'||_2 \leq \theta\sqrt{N}\}, \forall 1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq m.$$

Again by Theorem 4.2 in Ben-Tal et al. [9] we have further equivalence

$$\exists \lambda_{ij} \geq 0: \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_j(z) + \frac{\lambda_{ij}}{N\theta^2} \cdot I_s & \beta_{ij}(z) \\ \beta_{ij}(z)^\top & \alpha_{ij}(z) - \lambda_{ij} \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq m. \tag{56}$$

Combining (55) and (56) we obtain the following result.

PROPOSITION 8. *An exact reformualtion of the AARC of (52) is given by*

$$\min_{\substack{x \in X, t \in \mathbb{R}, y^l \in \mathbb{R}^m, l=1,\ldots s \\ \lambda_0, \lambda_{ij} \geq 0, i=1,\ldots,N, j=1,\ldots,s}} \{t: \ (55), (56) \ \textit{holds} \ \}. \tag{57}$$

Note that (52) is a fairly good approximation of the original two-stage DRSO problem (50) by Theorem 1. Hence, as long as the AARC of (52) is reasonably good, its semidefinite-program reformulation (57) provides a good tractable approximation of the two-stage linear DRSO (50).

5.3. Distributionally robust transportation problem: an illustration of the constructive proof approach. In this subsection, we demonstrate the power of our proof method by applying the same idea to a class of distributionally robust transportation problems.

Suppose $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is bounded, and let A denote a Borel probability measure on Ξ. In the famous paper of Beardwood et al. [7], it is shown that the length of the shortest traveling salesman tour through N i.i.d. random points with density f is asymptotically equal to $\beta\sqrt{N}\int_\Xi \sqrt{f}dA$ for some constant β. Since then, continuous approximations have been explored for many hard combinatorial problems, such as Steiner tree problems (Hwang and Richards [30]), space-filling curves (Platzman and Bartholdi [42], Bartholdi and Platzman [5]), facility location (Haimovich and Rinnooy Kan [28]), and Steele's generalization to sub-additive Euclidean functionals (Steele [49, 50]), which identifies a class of random processes whose limits are equal to $\beta\int_\Xi f^{(s-1)/s}dA$ for some β, where s is the dimension of Ξ.

Motivated by these results, Carlsson et al. [16] considers a continuous approximation of the traveling salesman problem in a distributionally robust setting. More specifically, they solve the worst-case problem $\sup_{f \in \mathfrak{A}} \int_\Xi \sqrt{f}dA$, in which the distributions with density functions f have to

lie in a Wasserstein ball. Using duality theory for convex functionals, they are able to reformulate the problem and obtain a representation of the worst-case distribution.

In the same spirit, we consider a slightly more general problem as follows. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{B} &:= \{d\mu/dA : \mu \in \mathcal{B}(\Xi), \mu \text{ is absolutely continuous w.r.t } A\},\\ \mathfrak{P} &:= \{d\mu/dA : \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi), \mu \text{ is absolutely continuous w.r.t } A\},\\ \mathfrak{A} &:= \{d\mu/dA \in \mathfrak{P} : W_p(\mu,\nu) \le \theta\},\end{aligned}$$

where $d\mu/dA$ denotes the Radon-Nikodym derivative. We use the overloaded notation $W_p(f,\nu)$ to represent the distance $W_p(\mu,\nu)$ between the nominal distribution $\nu = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{\xi}^i$ and the distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)$ such that $f = d\mu/dA$. Let $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be an increasing concave function approaching infinity. Consider the problem

$$v_P \quad = \quad \sup_{f\in\mathfrak{A}} \int_\Xi \mathcal{L}\circ f \, dA. \tag{58}$$

Our goal is to derive the strong dual of (58) and obtain a representation for the worst-case distribution using the same proof method as in Section 3.1.

Step 1. Derive weak duality.

First, we derive weak duality by writing the Lagrangian and applying a similar reasoning to the proof of Proposition 1. Note that in Kantorovich's duality (7), the supremum can be restricted to $u, v \in C_b(\Xi)$ (cf. Section 1.3 of Villani [52]). Then

$$\begin{aligned}
v_P &= \sup_{f\in\mathfrak{P}} \inf_{\lambda\ge 0} \left\{ \int_\Xi \mathcal{L}\circ f \, dA + \lambda(\theta^p - W_p^p(f,\nu)) \right\}\\
&\le \sup_{f\in\mathfrak{B}} \inf_{\lambda\ge 0} \left\{ \int_\Xi \mathcal{L}\circ f \, dA + \lambda(\theta^p - W_p^p(f,\nu)) \right\}\\
&\le \inf_{\lambda\ge 0} \left\{ \lambda\theta^p + \sup_{f\in\mathfrak{B}} \left\{ \int_\Xi \mathcal{L}\circ f \, dA - \lambda W_p^p(f,\nu) \right\} \right\}\\
&= \inf_{\lambda\ge 0} \left\{ \lambda\theta^p + \sup_{f\in\mathfrak{B}} \left\{ \int_\Xi \mathcal{L}\circ f \, dA - \lambda \sup_{u,v\in C_b(\Xi)} \left\{ \int_\Xi uf dA + \int_\Xi v d\nu \, : \, u(\xi) \le \inf_{\zeta\in\Xi} d^p(\xi,\zeta) - v(\zeta) \right\} \right\} \right\}\\
&= \inf_{\lambda\ge 0} \left\{ \lambda\theta^p + \sup_{f\in\mathfrak{B}} \left\{ \int_\Xi \mathcal{L}\circ f \, dA - \lambda \sup_{v\in C_b(\Xi) : \int_\Xi v d\nu = 0} \left\{ \int_\Xi \left[\inf_{\zeta\in\Xi} d^p(\xi,\zeta) - v(\zeta) \right] f(\xi) A(d\xi) \right\} \right\} \right\}\\
&\le \inf_{\substack{\lambda\ge 0\\ v\in C_b(\Xi) : \int_\Xi v d\nu = 0}} \left\{ \lambda\theta^p + \sup_{f\in\mathfrak{B}} \left\{ \int_\Xi [\mathcal{L}\circ f(\xi) - \lambda\Phi_v(\xi) f(\xi)] A(d\xi) \right\} \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 2, and in the last inequality $\Phi_v(\xi) := \inf_{\zeta\in\Xi}[d^p(\xi,\zeta) - v(\zeta)]$. Let

$$\mathcal{L}^*(a) \quad := \quad \sup_{x\ge 0} \mathcal{L}(x) - ax, \quad a \in \mathbb{R},$$

which can be viewed as the Legendre transform of concave function $\mathcal{L}$. Thus $\mathcal{L}^*$ is convex and we denote by $\partial\mathcal{L}^*(a)$ its subdifferential at $a \in \mathrm{dom}\mathcal{L}^*$, where $\mathrm{dom}\mathcal{L}^* := \{a \ge 0 : \mathcal{L}^*(a) < \infty\}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
v_P &\le \inf_{\substack{\lambda\ge 0\\ v\in C_b(\Xi) : \int_\Xi v d\nu = 0}} \left\{ \lambda\theta^p + \sup_{f\in\mathfrak{B}} \left\{ \int_\Xi [\mathcal{L}\circ f(\xi) - \lambda\Phi_v(\xi) f(\xi)] A(d\xi) \right\} \, : \, \lambda\Phi_v(\xi) \in \mathrm{dom}\mathcal{L}^*, \ A-a.e. \right\}\\
&\le \inf_{\substack{\lambda\ge 0\\ v\in C_b(\Xi) : \int_\Xi v d\nu = 0}} \left\{ \lambda\theta^p + \int_\Xi \mathcal{L}^*(\lambda\Phi_v(\xi)) A(d\xi) \right\}\\
&=: \inf_{\substack{\lambda\ge 0\\ v\in C_b(\Xi) : \int_\Xi v d\nu = 0}} h_v(\lambda)\\
&=: v_D.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2. Show the existence of a dual minimizer.

Since $\lim_{x\to\infty}\mathcal{L}(x)=\infty$, we have $(-\infty,0]\cap \mathrm{dom}\mathcal{L}^*=\varnothing$. It follows that $\lambda\Phi_v>0$ and thus $\lambda>0$ and $v<\mathrm{diam}(\Xi)$. Note that $\int_\Xi v d\nu=0$, hence there exists $M>0$, such that $||v||_\infty<M$ for all feasible v, thereby Φ_v is bounded on Ξ uniformly in v. It follows that $h(\lambda)$ approaches to ∞ as $\lambda\to\infty$ uniformly in v. Using the fact that $\nu=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N\widehat{\xi}^i$, we conclude that there exists $M>0$ such that

$$v_D=\inf_{\lambda,v}\left\{h(\lambda):0\le\lambda\le M,|v(\widehat{\xi}^i)|\le M,\sum_i v(\widehat{\xi}^i)=0\right\}.$$

Hence there exists a dual minimizer (λ^*,v^*).

Step 3. Use first-order optimality to construct a primal solution.

From Step 2 we know that $\lambda^*>0$. The first-order optimality at λ^* reads

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^p+\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda-}\int_\Xi\mathcal{L}^*(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi))\Phi_{v^*}(\xi)A(d\xi)\le 0,\\ \theta^p+\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda+}\int_\Xi\mathcal{L}^*(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi))\Phi_{v^*}(\xi)A(d\xi)\ge 0.\end{aligned}\tag{59}$$

Since Ξ is bounded, it follows that $\partial\mathcal{L}^*(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi))$ is bounded on Ξ, thus we can exchange differentiation and integration operators in the inequalities above. We define

$$f^*(\xi):=-\big[p^*\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda-}\mathcal{L}^*(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi))+(1-p^*)\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda+}\mathcal{L}^*(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi))\big],\ \forall\xi\in\mathrm{supp}\ A,\tag{60}$$

where

$$p^*:=\frac{\theta^p+\int_\Xi\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda+}\mathcal{L}^*(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi))\Phi_{v^*}(\xi)A(d\xi)}{\int_\Xi\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda+}\mathcal{L}^*(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi))\Phi_{v^*}(\xi)A(d\xi)-\int_\Xi\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda-}\mathcal{L}^*(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi))\Phi_{v^*}(\xi)A(d\xi)},$$

provided that the denominator is nonzero, otherwise we set $p^*=1$. By definition of $\mathcal{L}^*$, f is nonnegative. Also note that $\mathcal{L}^*$ is convex, so f^* is measurable.

Step 4. Verify the feasibility and optimality.

By construction, f^* is feasible since

$$W_p(f^*,\nu)=\max_{u,v\in C_b(\Xi):\int v d\nu=0}\left\{\int_\Xi uf^*dA:u(\xi)\le\Phi_{v^*}(\xi),\ \forall\xi\in\Xi\right\}\le\theta^p.$$

We verify that f^* is primal optimal. From the concavity of $\mathcal{L}$, we have $\mathcal{L}(f^*(\xi))\ge p^*\mathcal{L}^*(-\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda-}\mathcal{L}(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi)))+(1-p^*)\mathcal{L}(-\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda+}\mathcal{L}^*(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi)))$. Using (59) and the fact that $\mathcal{L}(x)-ax=\mathcal{L}^*(a)$ for all $x\in-\partial\mathcal{L}^*(a)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}v_P&\ge\int_\Xi\mathcal{L}(f^*(\xi))A(d\xi)\\&\ge p^*\int_\Xi\mathcal{L}(-\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda-}\mathcal{L}(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi)))A(d\xi)+(1-p^*)\int_\Xi\mathcal{L}^*(-\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda+}\mathcal{L}^*(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi)))A(d\xi)\\&=p^*\int_\Xi\Big[\mathcal{L}^*(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi))-\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi)\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda-}\mathcal{L}^*(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi))\Big]A(d\xi)\\&\quad+(1-p^*)\int_\Xi\Big[\mathcal{L}^*(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi))-\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi)\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda+}\mathcal{L}^*(\lambda^*\Phi_{v^*}(\xi))\Big]A(d\xi)\\&=v_D.\end{aligned}$$

Hence we conclude that there exists a worst-case distribution of the form (60). In particular, when $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)=\sqrt{\cdot}$, we have $\partial L^*(a)=\frac{1}{4a^2}$, $f^*(\xi)=\frac{1}{4\lambda^{*2}\Phi_{v^*}(\xi)^2}$, and $\lambda^*=\sqrt{\int_\Xi\frac{1}{4\theta^p\Phi_{v^*}}dA}$. We remark that we obtain a slightly more compact form than that in Carlsson et al. [16].

6. Conclusions In this paper, we developed a constructive proof method to derive the dual reformulation of distributionally robust stochastic optimization with Wasserstein distance under a general setting. Such approach allows us to obtain a precise structural description of the worst-case distribution and connects the distributionally robust stochastic optimization to classical robust programming. Based on our results, we obtain many theoretical and computational implications. For the future work, extensions to multi-stage distributionally robust stochastic optimization will be explored.

Appendix A: Lemmas and Proofs The lemmas and proofs are presented in the order as they appear in the paper.

Proof of Lemma 1. Let γ_0 be a minimizer of (5). It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\mathbb{E}_\mu[\Psi(\xi)] - \mathbb{E}_\nu[\Psi(\xi)]\right| &\le \int_{\Xi\times\Xi} |\Psi(\xi)-\Psi(\zeta)|\gamma_0(d\xi,d\zeta)\\ &\le \int_{\Xi\times\Xi} (Ld^p(\xi,\zeta)+M)\,\gamma_0(d\xi,d\zeta)\\ &= LW_p^p(\mu,\nu)+M\\ &\le L\theta^p + M.\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 2. Let (u_0, v_0) be any feasible solution for the maximization problem above and let $u_t(\xi) := u(\xi)+t$ and $v_t(\zeta) := v(\zeta)-t$ for any $t\in\mathbb{R}$, $\xi,\zeta\in\Xi$. Then it follows that $u_t(\xi)+v_t(\zeta)\le d^p(\xi,\zeta)$ for all $\xi,\zeta\in\Xi$, and

$$\int_\Xi u_t(\xi)\mu(d\xi)+\int_\Xi v_t(\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) \;=\; \int_\Xi u_0(\xi)\mu(d\xi)+\int_\Xi v_0(\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)+t[\mu(\Xi)-\nu(\Xi)].$$

Since $\mu(\Xi)\neq\nu(\Xi)$,

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{\int_\Xi u_t(\xi)\mu(d\xi)+\int_\Xi v_t(\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)\right\} \;=\; \infty,$$

and thus $W_p^p(\mu,\nu)=\infty$. □

Lemma 4. *Let $\kappa := \limsup_{d(\xi,\zeta_0)\to\infty}\frac{\Psi(\xi)-\Psi(\zeta_0)}{d^p(\xi,\zeta_0)}$ for some $\zeta_0\in\Xi$. Then for any $\zeta\in\Xi$, it holds that*

$$\limsup_{d(\xi,\zeta)\to\infty}\frac{\Psi(\xi)-\Psi(\zeta)}{d^p(\xi,\zeta)}=\kappa.$$

Proof of Lemma 4. Suppose that for some $\zeta\in\Xi$, it holds that $\kappa' := \limsup_{d(\xi,\zeta)\to\infty}\frac{\Psi(\xi)-\Psi(\zeta)}{d^p(\xi,\zeta)} < \kappa$. Then for any $\epsilon\in(0,\kappa-\kappa')$, there exists $R>0$ such that for any ξ with $d(\xi,\zeta)\ge R$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(\xi)-\Psi(\zeta_0) &= \Psi(\xi)-\Psi(\zeta)+\Psi(\zeta)-\Psi(\zeta_0)\\ &< (\kappa'+\epsilon)d^p(\xi,\zeta)+[\Psi(\zeta)-\Psi(\zeta_0)].\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{d(\xi,\zeta_0)\to\infty}\frac{\Psi(\xi)-\Psi(\zeta_0)}{d^p(\xi,\zeta_0)} &\le \limsup_{d(\xi,\zeta_0)\to\infty}\frac{\Psi(\xi)-\Psi(\zeta_0)}{d^p(\xi,\zeta)-d^p(\zeta_0,\zeta)}\\ &\le \limsup_{d(\xi,\zeta)\to\infty}\frac{(\kappa'+\epsilon)(d^p(\xi,\zeta))+[\Psi(\zeta)-\Psi(\zeta_0)]}{d^p(\xi,\zeta)-d^p(\zeta_0,\zeta)}\\ &= \kappa'+\epsilon<\kappa,\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. We note that the above proof also holds for $\kappa=\infty$. □

Proof of Lemma 3. (i) Using Lemma 5 with $\epsilon := \frac{\lambda-\lambda_1}{2\lambda_1}$, we have that

$$\lambda_1 d^p(\xi,\zeta_0) \le \frac{\lambda+\lambda_1}{2} d^p(\xi,\zeta) + \lambda_1 C_p(\epsilon) d^p(\zeta,\zeta_0), \quad \forall \xi,\zeta \in \Xi.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda d^p(\xi,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi) &= \frac{\lambda-\lambda_1}{2} d^p(\xi,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi) + \frac{\lambda+\lambda_1}{2} d^p(\xi,\zeta) \\
&\ge \frac{\lambda-\lambda_1}{2} d^p(\xi,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi) + \lambda_1 d^p(\xi,\zeta_0) - \lambda_1 C_p(\epsilon) d^p(\zeta,\zeta_0) \\
&\ge \frac{\lambda-\lambda_1}{2} d^p(\xi,\zeta) + \Phi(\lambda_1,\zeta_0) - \lambda_1 C_p(\epsilon) d^p(\zeta,\zeta_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence for any $\xi \in \Xi$ satisfying $\lambda d^p(\xi,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi) \le \Phi(\lambda,\zeta) + \delta$ for some $\delta \ge 0$, we have

$$\frac{\lambda-\lambda_1}{2} d^p(\xi,\zeta) \le \Phi(\lambda,\zeta) - \Phi(\lambda_1,\zeta_0) + \lambda_1 C_p(\epsilon) d^p(\zeta,\zeta_0) + \delta.$$

(ii) For any $\zeta \in \Xi$, $\Phi(\cdot,\zeta)$ is the infimum of non-decreasing linear functions of λ and thus $\Phi(\cdot,\zeta)$ is non-decreasing and concave on Λ. To show the continuity, let $\{(\lambda_n,\zeta_n)\}_n$ be a sequence in $\mathrm{int}(\Lambda)\times\Xi$ convergent to $(\lambda,\zeta) \in \mathrm{int}(\Lambda)\times\Xi$. Then there exists a sequence $\{\xi_n\}_n \subset \Xi$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \lambda_n d^p(\xi_n,\zeta_n) - \Psi(\xi_n) - \Phi(\lambda_n,\zeta_n) = 0.$$

Observe that $\Phi(\lambda_n,\zeta_n) \le \lambda_n d^p(\xi,\zeta_n) - \Psi(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in \Xi$, taking lim sup on both sides yields

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \Phi(\lambda_n,\zeta_n) \le \lambda d^p(\xi,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi), \quad \forall \xi \in \Xi.$$

Then taking the infimum of both sides, we obtain $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \Phi(\lambda_n,\zeta_n) \le \Phi(\lambda,\zeta)$. On the other hand, observing that $\{\xi_n\}_n$ is bounded by (i), and using $(x-y)^p \ge x^p - pyx^{p-1}$ for $x \ge y > 0$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{n\to\infty} \Phi(\lambda_n,\zeta_n) &= \liminf_{n\to\infty} \lambda_n d^p(\xi_n,\zeta_n) - \Psi(\xi_n) \\
&\ge \liminf_{n\to\infty} \lambda_n d^p(\xi_n,\zeta) - \lambda_n p d^{p-1}(\xi_n,\zeta) d(\zeta_n,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi_n) \\
&= \liminf_{n\to\infty} \lambda_n d^p(\xi_n,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi_n) \\
&\ge \Phi(\lambda,\zeta).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have shown that Φ is continuous on $(\kappa,\infty)\times\Xi$. Now suppose $\Phi(\kappa,\zeta) > -\infty$. For any $\delta > 0$, there exists ξ^δ such that $\kappa d^p(\xi^\delta,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi^\delta) < \Phi(\kappa,\zeta) + \delta/2$ and so for any $\kappa < \lambda < \kappa + \frac{\epsilon}{2d^p(\xi^\delta,\zeta)}$,

$$0 \le \Phi(\lambda,\zeta) - \Phi(\kappa,\zeta) < (\lambda-\kappa) d^p(\xi^\delta,\zeta) + \delta/2 < \delta.$$

It follows that $\lim_{\lambda\downarrow\kappa} \Phi(\lambda,\zeta) = \Phi(\kappa,\zeta)$.

(iii) For any $\delta > 0$, let $\xi_i^\delta \in \Xi$ be such that $\lambda_i d^p(\xi_i^\delta,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi_i^\delta) \le \Phi(\lambda_i,\zeta) + \delta$, $i = 1,2$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_2 d^p(\xi_2^\delta,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi_2^\delta) &\le \Phi(\lambda_2,\zeta) + \delta \\
&\le \lambda_2 d^p(\xi_1^\delta,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi_1^\delta) + \delta \\
&= (\lambda_2-\lambda_1) d^p(\xi_1^\delta,\zeta) + \lambda_1 d^p(\xi_1^\delta,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi_1^\delta) + \delta \\
&\le (\lambda_2-\lambda_1) d^p(\xi_1^\delta,\zeta) + \Phi(\lambda_1,\zeta) + 2\delta \\
&\le (\lambda_2-\lambda_1) d^p(\xi_1^\delta,\zeta) + \lambda_1 d^p(\xi_2^\delta,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi_2^\delta) + 2\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)d^p(\xi_2^\delta,\zeta)\le(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)d^p(\xi_1^\delta,\zeta)+2\delta$. Let $\delta\to 0$ and using (12), we obtain the result.

(iv) For any $\delta>0$, let ξ_i^δ be such that $\lambda_i d^p(\xi_i^\delta,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi_i^\delta)\le\Phi(\lambda_i,\zeta)+\delta$, $i=1,2$. Then

$$\Phi(\lambda_1,\zeta)-\Phi(\lambda_2,\zeta)\le\lambda_1 d^p(\xi_2^\delta,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi_2^\delta)-\Big[\lambda_2 d^p(\xi_2^\delta,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi_2^\delta)-\delta\Big]=(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)d^p(\xi_2^\delta,\zeta)+\delta.$$

Similarly, $\Phi(\lambda_2,\zeta)-\Phi(\lambda_1,\zeta)\le(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)d^p(\xi_1^\delta,\zeta)+\delta$. Dividing by $\lambda_2-\lambda_1$ we obtain that

$$d^p(\xi_2^\delta,\zeta)-\frac{\delta}{\lambda_2-\lambda_1}\le\frac{\Phi(\lambda_2,\zeta)-\Phi(\lambda_1,\zeta)}{\lambda_2-\lambda_1}\le d^p(\xi_1^\delta,\zeta)+\frac{\delta}{\lambda_2-\lambda_1}.$$

Letting $\delta\to 0$ and using (12), we obtain that

$$\overline{D}^p(\lambda_2,\zeta)\le\frac{\Phi(\lambda_2,\zeta)-\Phi(\lambda_1,\zeta)}{\lambda_2-\lambda_1}\le\underline{D}^p(\lambda_1,\zeta).$$

Since Φ is concave in λ as we proved in (ii), the left and right derivative $\partial_{\lambda\pm}\Phi(\lambda,\zeta)$ exist. Setting $\lambda_1=\lambda$ and letting $\lambda_2\downarrow\lambda$ in the inequality above, and using monotonicity of $\overline{D}$ and $\underline{D}$ as proved in (iii), we have that

$$\lim_{\lambda_2\downarrow\lambda}\overline{D}^p(\lambda_2,\zeta)\le\frac{\partial\Phi(\lambda,\zeta)}{\partial\lambda+}\le\underline{D}^p(\lambda,\zeta),$$

and similarly, setting $\lambda_2=\lambda$ and letting $\lambda_1\uparrow\lambda$ yields

$$\overline{D}^p(\lambda,\zeta)\le\frac{\partial\Phi(\lambda,\zeta)}{\partial\lambda-}\le\lim_{\lambda_1\uparrow\lambda}\underline{D}^p(\lambda_1,\zeta).$$

If $\Xi=\mathbb{R}^s$, we show that $\lim_{\lambda'\uparrow\lambda}\underline{D}(\lambda',\zeta)=\overline{D}(\lambda,\zeta)$. Let $\{\lambda_n\}\subset(\kappa,\lambda)$ with $\lambda_n\uparrow\lambda$ as $n\to\infty$. Using monotonicity from (iii), suppose on the contrary, there exists $\epsilon>0$, such that $\underline{D}(\lambda_n,\zeta)>\overline{D}(\lambda,\zeta)+\epsilon$ for all n. Since $\lambda_n>\kappa$, the set $\{\xi\in\Xi:\lambda_n d^p(\xi,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi)=\Phi(\lambda_n,\zeta)\}$ is bounded and closed, hence there exists $\{\xi_n\}_n$ satisfying

$$\xi_n\in\arg\max_{\xi\in\Xi}\{d(\xi,\zeta):\lambda_n d^p(\xi,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi)=\Phi(\lambda_n,\zeta)\},\quad\forall n,$$

and let

$$\overline{\xi}\in\arg\max_{\xi\in\Xi}\{d(\xi,\zeta):\lambda d^p(\xi,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi)=\Phi(\lambda,\zeta)\}.$$

By (i) and (ii) we know that $\{\xi_n\}_n$ is bounded, and thus there exists a subsequence $\{\xi_{n_k}\}_k$ convergent to ξ_0 as $k\to\infty$. It follows that $\lambda d^p(\xi_0,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi_0)\le\lim_{k\to\infty}\lambda_{n_k}d^p(\xi_{n_k},\zeta)-\Psi(\xi_{n_k})$ and

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\lambda_{n_k}d^p(\xi_{n_k},\zeta)-\Psi(\xi_{n_k})\le\liminf_{k\to\infty}\lambda_{n_k}d^p(\overline{\xi},\zeta)-\Psi(\overline{\xi})=\lambda d^p(\overline{\xi},\zeta)-\Psi(\overline{\xi})=\Phi(\lambda,\zeta).$$

Thus $\lambda d^p(\xi_0,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi_0)\le\Phi(\lambda,\zeta)$. But $d(\xi_0,\zeta)=\lim_{k\to\infty}d(\xi_{n_k},\zeta)=\lim_{k\to\infty}D(\lambda_{n_k},\zeta)\ge\overline{D}(\lambda,\zeta)+\epsilon$, which is a contradiction. Similarly, we can show that $\lim_{\lambda'\downarrow\lambda}\overline{D}(\lambda',\zeta)=\underline{D}(\lambda,\zeta)$.

(v) Let $\delta>0$. By Definition 1.11 in Ambrosio et al. [1], ν has an extension, still denoted by ν, such that the measurable space $(\Xi,\mathscr{B}_\nu,\nu)$ is complete. Define the set-valued mapping $S:(\Xi,\mathscr{B}_\nu)\rightrightarrows(\Xi,\mathscr{B}(\Xi))$

$$S^\delta(\zeta):=\{\xi\in\Xi:\ \lambda d(\xi,\zeta)-\Psi(\xi)\le\Phi(\lambda,\zeta)+\delta\}.$$

Then S^δ is non-empty valued. We show that S^δ has closed graph $\mathrm{Gr}(S^\delta)$. Indeed, let $\{(\zeta_k,\xi_k)\}_k$ be a sequence in $\mathrm{Gr}(S^\delta)$ convergent to $(\zeta_0,\xi_0)\in\Xi\times\Xi$. From upper semi-continuity of Ψ, and continuity of d and Φ, we have that $\lambda d^p(\xi_0,\zeta_0)-\Psi(\xi_0)\le\Phi(\lambda,\zeta_0)+\delta$. Therefore $(\zeta_0,\xi_0)\in\mathrm{Gr}(S^\delta)$, that is, $\mathrm{Gr}(S^\delta)$ is closed and thus $\mathscr{B}_\nu\otimes\mathscr{B}(\Xi)$-measurable. By Theorem 3.5(iii) in Himmelberg [29], S^δ is

$(\mathscr{B}_\nu, \mathscr{B}(\Xi)$-measurable with closed graph. Denote by $\overline{\text{conv}}$ the convex hull of the closure of a set. Define the set-valued map $D^\delta : (\Xi, \mathscr{B}_\nu) \rightrightarrows (\mathbb{R}, \mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ by

$$D^\delta(\zeta) \;:=\; \overline{\text{conv}}\{d(\zeta,\xi) \,:\, \xi \in S^\delta(\zeta)\}.$$

Since d is a bivariate continuous function, and the set-valued map S^δ has closed value, by Theorem 8.2.8 and 8.2.2 in Aubin and Frankowska [3], D^δ is $(\mathscr{B}_\nu, \mathscr{B}(\Xi))$-measurable. Define functions $\overline{D}^\delta, \underline{D}^\delta : \Xi \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\overline{D}^\delta(\zeta) := \sup_{\xi\in\Xi}\{d(\xi,\zeta) :\; \xi \in S^\delta(\zeta)\}, \quad \underline{D}^\delta(\zeta) := \inf_{\xi\in\Xi}\{d(\xi,\zeta) :\; \xi \in S^\delta(\zeta)\}.$$

Observe that $\text{Gr}(\overline{D}^\delta) = \text{Gr}(\overline{\text{conv}(D^\delta \cup \infty)})$ and $\text{Gr}(\underline{D}^\delta) = \text{Gr}(\overline{\text{conv}(D^\delta \cup -\infty)})$, thus they are $\mathscr{B}_\nu \otimes \mathscr{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable, then by Theorem 3.5(iii) in Himmelberg [29]), $\overline{D}^\delta$ and $\underline{D}^\delta$ are ν-measurable with closed value. Define closed-valued maps $\overline{R}^\delta_\epsilon, \underline{R}^\delta_\epsilon : \Xi \rightrightarrows \Xi$ by

$$\overline{R}^\delta_\epsilon(\zeta) := \{\xi \in \Xi : d(\xi,\zeta) \geq \overline{D}^\delta(\zeta) - \epsilon\}, \quad \underline{R}^\delta_\epsilon(\zeta) := \{\xi \in \Xi : d(\xi,\zeta) \leq \underline{D}^\delta(\zeta) + \epsilon\},$$

Since $\text{Gr}(\overline{R}^\delta_\epsilon) = \{(\zeta,\xi) : d(\xi,\zeta) - \overline{D}^\delta(\zeta) + \epsilon \geq 0\}$ and using Theorem 3.5(iii) in Himmelberg [29] again, we have that $\overline{R}^\delta_\epsilon$ is $(\mathscr{B}_\nu, \mathscr{B}(\Xi))$-measurable, and similarly for $\underline{R}^\delta_\epsilon$. Define the set-valued maps $\overline{T}^\delta_\epsilon, \underline{T}^\delta_\epsilon : \Xi \rightrightarrows \Xi$ by

$$\overline{T}^\delta_\epsilon(\zeta) = S^\delta(\zeta) \cap \overline{R}^\delta_\epsilon(\zeta), \quad \underline{T}^\delta_\epsilon(\zeta) = S^\delta(\zeta) \cap \underline{R}^\delta_\epsilon(\zeta).$$

Then $\overline{T}^\delta$ and $\underline{T}^\delta$ have non-empty and closed values and by Theorem 4.1 in Himmelberg [29], they are ν-measurable. Therefore, using Kuratowski–Ryll-Nardzewski measurable selection theorem (see, e.g. Theorem 4.1 in Wagner [54]), we finally conclude that $\overline{T}^\delta$ and $\underline{T}^\delta$ have ν-measurable selections.

When $\Phi(\kappa,\zeta) > -\infty$, using the similar argument as above, we can shown the existence of $\overline{T}^\delta(\zeta)$. When $\Xi = \mathbb{R}^s$, the above-mentioned measurable selections are well-defined even for $\delta, \epsilon = 0$. □

LEMMA 5. *Let $x, y \geq 0$, $p \geq 1$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $C_p(\epsilon) \geq 1$ such that*

$$(x+y)^p \leq (1+\epsilon)x^p + C_p(\epsilon)y^p.$$

Proof of Lemma 5. It suffices to show that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists C such that

$$f(t) := 1 + \epsilon + Ct^p - (1+t)^p \geq 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Set

$$t_0(\epsilon) = \sup\{t \geq 0 : 1 + \epsilon \geq (1+t)^p\},$$

then $t_0 > 0$ and $f(t) \geq 0$ for $t \in [0, t_0]$. Note that $f'(t)/p = Ct^{p-1} - (1+t)^{p-1}$. Now define

$$C_p(\epsilon) := \sup_{t \geq t_0(\epsilon)} \frac{(1+t)^{p-1}}{t^{p-1}}.$$

Then $C_p(\epsilon) < \infty$ since $\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{(1+t)^{p-1}}{t^{p-1}} = 1$. It follows that for any $C \geq C_p(\epsilon)$, $f'(t) \geq 0$ on $[t_0, \infty)$, and therefore $f(t) \geq 0$ on $[0, \infty)$. □

Proof of Proposition 2. Choose any compact set $E \subset \Xi$ with $\nu(E) > 0$ and let $\bar{\xi} \in \arg\max_{\xi\in E} \Psi(\xi)$. Thus for any $M, R > 0$, there exists ζ_M such that $d(\zeta_M, \bar{\xi}) > R$ and that

$$\Psi(\zeta_M) - \Psi(\bar{\xi}) > M(d^p(\zeta_M, \bar{\xi}) + \text{diam}(E)),$$

where $\mathrm{diam}(E) := \max_{\xi,\xi' \in E} d(\xi,\xi')$. It follows that

$$\Psi(\zeta_M) - \Psi(\xi) > d^p(\zeta_M, \xi), \quad \forall \xi \in E.$$

Thereby we define a map $T_M : \Xi \to \Xi$ by

$$T_M(\zeta) := \zeta_M \mathbb{1}_{\{\zeta \in E\}} + \zeta \mathbb{1}_{\{\zeta \in \Xi \setminus E\}}, \ \forall \zeta \in \Xi,$$

and let

$$\mu_M := p_M T_{M\#}\nu + \Big(1 - p_M\Big)\nu,$$

where $p_M := \frac{\theta^p}{\int_E d^p(\zeta_M,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)}$. Note that we can always make $p_M \le 1$ by choosing sufficiently large R. Then μ_M is primal feasible and

$$v_P - \int_\Xi \Psi(\xi)\nu(d\xi) \ge p_M \int_E [\Psi(T_M(\zeta)) - \Psi(\zeta)]\nu(d\zeta) > p_M M \int_E d^p(T_M(\zeta),\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) = M\theta^p,$$

which goes to ∞ as $M \to \infty$. On the other hand, for any $\lambda \ge 0$ and $\zeta \in E$, $\Phi(\lambda,\zeta) = -\infty$, whence $v_D = \infty$. Therefore we prove that $v_P = v_D$. $\square$



FIGURE 7. Illustration of duality $v_p = \infty$ when $\kappa = \infty$.

Proof of Proposition 3. On one hand, since $\Phi(\lambda,\zeta) \le -\Psi(\zeta)$ for all ζ, we have that

$$v_D = \inf_{\lambda \ge 0} \left\{ -\int_\Xi \Phi(\lambda,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) \right\} \ge \int_\Xi \Psi(\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) = v_P.$$

On the other hand, using Lemma 3(i) and $\Phi(\lambda,\zeta) \le -\Psi(\zeta)$, we can apply dominated convergence to obtain $v_D \le -\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \int_\Xi \Phi(\lambda,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) = \int_\Xi \Psi(\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) = v_P$. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 1. (ii)(i) When $\lambda^* > \kappa$, by Lemma 3(iv) and (v) we can choose $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda^*$ and $\delta = \epsilon = 0$ in Case 1 of the proof of Theorem 1, such that $p^* \overline{T}^0_{\lambda^*\#}\nu + (1-p^*)\underline{T}^0_{\lambda^*\#}\nu$ is optimal.

When $\lambda^* = \kappa > 0$ and condition (25) holds, by Lemma 3(v), there exists ν-measurable maps $\underline{T}, \overline{T} : \Xi \to \Xi$, such that $\kappa d^p(\underline{T}(\zeta),\zeta) - \Psi(\underline{T}(\zeta)) = \Phi(\kappa,\zeta) = \kappa d^p(\overline{T}(\zeta),\zeta) - \Psi(\overline{T}(\zeta))$,

$$\int_\Xi d^p(\underline{T}(\zeta),\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) \le \theta^p \le \int_\Xi d^p(\overline{T}(\zeta),\zeta)\nu(d\zeta).$$

Hence there exists $q \in [0,1]$ such that

$$q \int_\Xi d^p(\underline{T}(\zeta),\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) + (1-q)\int_\Xi d^p(\overline{T}(\zeta),\zeta) = \theta^p.$$

Let

$$\mu \;:=\; q\underline{T}_{\#}\nu + (1-q)\overline{T}_{\#}\nu.$$

Then μ is feasible and

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Xi}\Psi(\xi)\mu(d\xi) &= q\int_{\Xi}\Psi(\underline{T}(\zeta))\nu(d\zeta) + (1-q)\int_{\Xi}\Psi(\overline{T}(\zeta))\nu(d\zeta)\\ &= q\int_{\Xi}[\kappa d^p(\underline{T}(\zeta),\zeta) - \Phi(\kappa,\zeta)]\nu(d\zeta) + (1-q)\int_{\Xi}[\kappa d^p(\overline{T}(\zeta) - \Phi(\kappa,\zeta)]\nu(d\zeta)\\ &= \lambda^*\theta^p - \int_{\Xi}\Phi(\kappa,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore μ^* is optimal.

When $\lambda^* = 0$ and condition (26) holds, by Lemma 3(v), there exists ν-measurable map $\underline{T}:\Xi\to\Xi$, such that

$$\int_{\Xi} d^p(\underline{T}(\zeta),\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) \le \theta^p.$$

Define $\mu := \underline{T}_{\#}\nu$. It follows that

$$\int_{\Xi}\Psi(\xi)\mu(d\xi) = \int_{\Xi}\Psi(\underline{T}(\zeta))\nu(d\zeta) = \int_{\Xi}[-\Phi(0,\zeta)]\nu(d\zeta) = \max_{\xi\in\Xi}\Psi(\xi) = v_D.$$

Therefore we have shown the "if" part.

To prove the "only if" part, let us first consider consider $\lambda^* = \kappa$ and condition (25) fails to hold. Let γ_0 be such that $\int_{\Xi^2} d(\xi,\zeta)\gamma_0(d\xi,d\zeta) = W_p(\mu,\nu)$, and let γ_ζ be the conditional distribution of ξ given ζ under the joint distribution γ_0 (whose existence is ensured by disintegration theorem, see, e.g., Section 12.2 in Ambrosio et al. [2]). Then

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa\theta^p - \int_{\Xi}\Phi(\kappa,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) = \int_{\Xi}\Psi(\xi)\mu(d\xi) &= \int_{\Xi}\int_{\Xi}[\Psi(\xi) - \kappa d^p(\xi,\zeta)]\gamma_\zeta(d\xi)\nu(d\zeta) + \int_{\Xi^2}\kappa d^p(\xi,\zeta)\gamma_0(d\xi,d\zeta)\\ &\le -\int_{\Xi}\Phi(\kappa,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) + \kappa\theta^p.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, to make the inequality holds as equality, it must hold that (a) $\{\xi : \kappa d^p(\xi,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi) = \Phi(\kappa,\zeta)\}$ is non-empty for ν-almost every ζ, (b) $\int_{\Xi^2} d^p(\xi,\zeta)\gamma_0(d\xi,d\zeta)$, and (c) for ν-almost every ζ, the conditional distribution γ_ζ of ξ should be supported on the set $\{\xi : \kappa d^(\xi,\zeta) - \Psi(\xi) = \Phi(\kappa,\zeta)\}$. Now, if $\int_{\Xi}\overline{D}_0^p(\kappa,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) < \theta^p$, suppose μ is an optimal solution. Since

$$\int_{\Xi}\int_{\Xi} d^p(\xi,\zeta)\gamma_\zeta(d\xi)\nu(d\zeta) \le \int_{\Xi}\overline{D}_0^p(\kappa,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) < \theta^p,$$

(b) and (c) cannot be true simultaneously, which is a contradiction. If $\theta^p < \int_{\Xi}\underline{D}_0^p(\kappa,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)$, by Lemma 3(i)(iv) and (v), we have that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda+}\int_{\Xi}\Phi(\kappa,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) = \int_{\Xi}\underline{D}_0^p(\kappa,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) > \theta^p.$$

Therefore, there exists $\lambda > \kappa$, such that $\kappa\theta^p - \int_{\Xi}\Phi(\kappa,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) > \lambda\theta^p - \int_{\Xi}\Phi(\lambda,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta)$, and thus κ cannot be a dual minimizer.

Now when $\lambda^* = 0$ and condition (26) fails to hold, namely, $\int_{\Xi}\underline{D}_0^p(0,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) > \theta^p$. Suppose μ is optimal, namely, $\int_{\Xi}\Psi(\xi)\mu(d\xi) = \max_{\xi\in\Xi}\Psi(\xi)$. Let γ_0 be such that $\int_{\Xi^2} d(\xi,\zeta)\gamma_0(d\xi,d\zeta) = W_p(\mu,\nu)$, and let γ_ζ be the conditional distribution of ξ given ζ under the joint distribution γ_0. Then

$$\max_{\xi\in\Xi}\Psi(\xi) = \int_{\Xi}\Psi(\xi)\mu(d\xi) = \int_{\Xi^2}\Psi(\xi)\gamma_0(d\zeta,d\zeta) = \int_{\Xi}\int_{\Xi}\Psi(\xi)\gamma_\zeta(d\xi)\nu(d\zeta).$$

It follows that

$$\int_\Xi \Big[\int_\Xi \Psi(\xi)\gamma_\zeta(d\xi) - \max_{\xi\in\Xi} \Psi(\xi) \Big] \nu(d\zeta) = 0.$$

Then for ν-almost every ζ, the conditional distribution of ξ should be supported on the set $\{\xi : \Psi(\xi) = \max_{\xi'\in\Xi} \Psi(\xi)\}$. However, $\int_\Xi \underline{D}_0^p(0,\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) > \theta^p$ implies the Wasserstein distance between μ and ζ cannot be smaller than θ, thus μ is infeasible and we arrive at a contradiction.

(iii) Suppose there exists a compact set $E \subset \Xi$ with $\nu(E) > 0$ such that $\Psi(\zeta) > \Phi(\kappa,\zeta)$ for all $\zeta \in E$. By continuity of Φ, there exists $\lambda_0 > \kappa$ such that $\Psi(\zeta) > \Phi(\lambda_0,\zeta)$ for all $\zeta \in E$. By Lemma 3(v), there exists a ν-measurable map $T_{\lambda_0} : \Xi \to \Xi$, such that $\lambda_0 d^p(T_{\lambda_0}(\zeta),\zeta) - \Psi(T_{\lambda_0}(\zeta)) = \Phi(\lambda_0,\zeta)$, and $d(T_{\lambda_0}(\zeta),\zeta) > 0$ for all $\zeta \in E$, and thus $\epsilon = \int_E d^p(T_{\lambda_0}(\zeta),\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) > 0$. On the other hand, according to Case 2 and 3 in the proof of Theorem 1 with $\delta = 0$, $\lambda^* = \kappa$ implies $\int_\Xi d^p(T_\lambda^0(\zeta),\zeta)\nu(d\zeta) < \theta^p$ for all $\lambda > \kappa$. But this cannot hold for $\lambda < \lambda_0$ and $\theta < \epsilon^{1/p}$. Hence for $\theta < \epsilon^{1/p}$ we have $\lambda^* > \kappa$. □

Proof of Proposition 4. Since $-\mathbb{1}\{\xi \in \mathrm{int}(C)\}$ is upper semi-continuous and binary-valued, Theorem 1 ensures the existence of the worst-case distribution of $\min_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}} \mu(\mathrm{int}(C))$. Thus it suffices to show that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}$ such that $\mu(C) \le \min_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}} \mu(\mathrm{int}(C)) + \epsilon$.

Using Corollary 1, the worst-case distribution of $\min_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}} \mu(\mathrm{int}(C))$ exists and there exists an optimal transportation plan γ_0 such that

$$\mathrm{supp}\ \gamma_0 \subset \big(\mathrm{supp}\ \nu \times \mathrm{supp}\ \nu\big) \cup \big((\mathrm{supp}\ \nu \cap \mathrm{int}(C)) \times \partial C\big).$$

We set $\mu_0 := \pi^2_\# \gamma_0$.

If $\mu_0(\partial C) = 0$, there is nothing to show, so we assume that $\mu_0(\partial C) > 0$. We first consider the case $\nu(\mathrm{int}(C)) = 0$ (and thus μ_0 can be chosen to be ν). By Lemma 6, we can define a Borel map T_ϵ which maps each $\xi \in \partial C$ to some $\xi' \in \Xi \setminus \mathrm{cl}(C)$ with $d(\xi,\xi') < \epsilon \in (0,\theta)$ and is an identity map elsewhere. We further define a distribution μ_ϵ by

$$\mu_\epsilon(A) := \mu_0(A \setminus \partial C) + \mu_0\{\xi \in \partial C : T_\epsilon(\xi) \in A\}, \text{ for all Borel set } A \subset \Xi.$$

Then $W_p(\mu_\epsilon,\mu_0) \le \epsilon < \theta$ and $\mu_\epsilon(C) = \mu_0(\mathrm{int}(C))$.

Now let us consider $\nu(\mathrm{int}(C)) > 0$. For any $\epsilon \in (0,\theta)$, we define a distribution μ'_ϵ by

$$\begin{aligned}\mu'_\epsilon(A) :=& \mu_0(A \cap \mathrm{int}(C)) + \frac{\epsilon}{\theta}\Big(\mu_0\{(A \cap \mathrm{int}(C)) \times \partial C\} + \nu(A \cap \partial C)\Big) \\ &+ \Big(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{\theta}\Big)\mu_0\{\xi \in \partial C : T_\epsilon(\xi) \in A\} + \mu_0(A \setminus \mathrm{cl}(C)),\end{aligned}$$

for all Borel set $A \subset \Xi$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mu'_\epsilon(C) &= \mu_0(\mathrm{int}(C)) + \frac{\epsilon}{\theta}[\mu_0(\partial C) - \nu(\partial C) + \nu(\partial C)] + 0 + 0 \\ &\le \mu_0(\mathrm{int}(C)) + \frac{\epsilon}{\theta}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $W_p^p(\mu_0,\nu) = \int_{\mathrm{int}(C)\times\partial C} d^p(\xi,\zeta)\gamma_0(d\xi,d\zeta)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}W_p(\mu'_\epsilon,\nu) &\le \int_{\mathrm{int}(C)\times\partial C} d^p(\xi,\zeta)\gamma_0(d\xi,d\zeta) - \frac{\epsilon}{\theta}\int_{\mathrm{int}(C)\times\partial C} d^p(\xi,\zeta)\gamma_0(d\xi,d\zeta) + \Big(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{\theta}\Big)\epsilon + 0 \\ &\le \theta.\end{aligned}$$

Hence the proof is completed. □

LEMMA 6. *Let C be a Borel set in Ξ and has nonempty boundary ∂C. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a Borel map $T_\epsilon : \partial C \to \Xi \setminus \mathrm{cl}(C)$ such that $d(\xi, T_\epsilon(\xi)) < \epsilon$ for all $\xi \in \partial C$.*

Proof of Lemma 6. Since Ξ is separable, ∂C has a dense subset $\{\xi^i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$. For each ξ^i, there exists $\xi'^i \in \Xi \setminus \mathrm{cl}(\Xi)$ such that $\epsilon_i := 2d(\xi^i, \xi'^i) < \epsilon$. Thus $\partial C = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_{\epsilon_i}(\xi^i)$, where $B_{\epsilon_i}(\xi^i)$ is the open ball centered at ξ^i with radius ϵ_i. Define

$$i^*(\xi) := \min_{i \geq 0}\{i : \xi \in B_{\epsilon_i}(\xi^i)\}, \quad \xi \in \partial C,$$

and

$$T_\epsilon(\xi) := \xi_{i^*(\xi)}, \quad \xi \in \partial C.$$

Then T_ϵ satisfies the requirements in the lemma. □

Proof of Proposition 5. If $\theta = 0$, clearly $v^* \leq \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} m_i$. Let $\hat{X} := \{\widehat{\xi}_t^i : i = 1, \ldots, N, t = 1, \ldots, m_i\}$. Suppose the elements in $\hat{X}$ can be sorted in increasing order by $\widehat{\xi}_{(1)} < \ldots < \widehat{\xi}_{(M)}$, where $M = \mathrm{card}(\hat{X})$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, let $\underline{x}_j, \overline{x}_j = \widehat{\xi}_{(j)} \pm \epsilon/(2M)$. Then $v\big(\sum_{j=1}^{M} \mathbb{1}_{[\underline{x}_j, \overline{x}_j]}\big) = -c\epsilon + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} m_i$. Let $\epsilon \to 0$ we obtain (43). So in the sequel we assume $\theta > 0$.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\mu}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))] &= \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)} \big\{\mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\mu}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))] : \min_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\mu,\nu)} \mathbb{E}_\gamma[d(\eta,\hat{\eta})] \leq \theta\big\} \\ &= \inf_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi^2)} \big\{\mathbb{E}_{(\eta,\hat{\eta})\sim\gamma}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))] : \ \mathbb{E}_\gamma[d(\eta,\hat{\eta})] \leq \theta, \ \pi^2_{\#}\gamma = \nu\big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi^2)$, denote by $\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}$ the conditional distribution of $\bar{\theta} := d(\eta, \hat{\eta})$ given $\hat{\eta}$, and by $\gamma_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}$ the conditional distribution of η given $\hat{\eta}$ and $\bar{\theta}$. Using tower property of conditional probability, we have that for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi^2)$ with $\pi^2_{\#}\gamma = \nu$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(\eta,\hat{\eta})\sim\gamma}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))] = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\Big[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}}\big[\mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))]\big]\Big],$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_\gamma[d(\eta,\hat{\eta})] = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\big[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}}[\bar{\theta}]\big].$$

Note that the right-hand side of the equation above does not depend on $\gamma_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}$. Thereby (61) can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\mu}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))] &= \inf_{\{\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}\}_{\hat{\eta}}, \{\gamma_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}\}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}} \Big\{\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\Big[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}}\big[\mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))]\big]\Big] : \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\big[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}}[\bar{\theta}]\big] \leq \theta\Big\} \\ &= \inf_{\{\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}\}_{\hat{\eta}}} \left\{\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}}\left[\inf_{\{\gamma_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}\}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}} \mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))]\right]\right] : \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\big[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}}[\bar{\theta}]\big] \leq \theta\right\},\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where the second equality follows from interchangeability principle (cf. Theorem 14.60 in Rockafellar and Wets [44]).

$$\inf_{\{\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}\}_{\hat{\eta}}} \left\{\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}}\left[\inf_{\{\gamma_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}\}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}} \mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))]\right]\right] : \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\big[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}}[\bar{\theta}]\big] \leq \theta\right\} = 0.$$

We claim that

$$\begin{aligned}&\inf_{\{\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}\}_{\hat{\eta}}} \left\{\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}}\left[\inf_{\{\gamma_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}\}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}} \mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))]\right]\right] : \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\big[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}}[\bar{\theta}]\big] \leq \theta\right\} \\ &= \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}([0,1])\times\Xi)} \Big\{\mathbb{E}_{(\tilde{\eta},\hat{\eta})\sim\rho}[\tilde{\eta}(\mathrm{int}(x^{-1}(1)))] : \ \mathbb{E}_{(\tilde{\eta},\hat{\eta})\sim\rho}\big[W_1(\tilde{\eta},\hat{\eta})\big] \leq \theta, \ \pi^2_{\#}\rho = \nu\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

Indeed, let ρ be any feasible solution of the right-hand side of (63). We denote by $\rho_{\hat{\eta}}$ the conditional distribution of $\bar{\bar{\theta}} := W_1(\tilde{\eta}, \hat{\eta})$ given $\hat{\eta}$ and by $\rho_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\bar{\theta}}}$ the conditional distribution of $\tilde{\eta}$ given $\hat{\eta}$ and $\bar{\bar{\theta}}$.

When $\hat{\eta}=0$ or $\bar{\bar{\theta}}=0$, set $\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\eta}}=\delta_0$ and $\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}=\hat{\eta}$, that is, we choose $\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\eta}}$ and $\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}$ be such that $\eta=\hat{\eta}$. When $\hat{\eta}\neq 0$ and $\bar{\bar{\theta}}>0$, applying Corollary 1 and Lemma 4 to the problem $\min_{\tilde{\eta}\in\mathcal{B}([0,1])}\{\tilde{\eta}(x^{-1}(1)): W_1(\tilde{\eta},\hat{\eta})\le\bar{\bar{\theta}}\}$, we have that for any $\epsilon>0$, there exists $1\le i_0\le\hat{\eta}([0,1])$, $p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}\in[0,1]$, and

$$\tilde{\eta}=\sum_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq i_0}}^{\hat{\eta}([0,1])}\delta_{\tilde{\xi}^i}+p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}\delta_{\tilde{\xi}^+_{i_0}}+(1-p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}})\delta_{\tilde{\xi}^-_{i_0}},$$

where $\tilde{\xi}_i\in[0,1]$ for all $i\neq i_0$ and $\tilde{\xi}^{\pm}_{i_0}\in[0,1]$, such that $\tilde{\eta}(x^{-1}(1))\le\epsilon+\min_{\tilde{\eta}\in\mathcal{B}([0,1])}\{\tilde{\eta}(\mathrm{int}(x^{-1}(1))): W_1(\tilde{\eta},\hat{\eta})\le\bar{\bar{\theta}}\}$. Define

$$\eta^{\pm}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\bar{\theta}}}:=\sum_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq i_0}}^{\hat{\eta}([0,1])}\delta_{\tilde{\xi}^i}+\delta_{\tilde{\xi}^{\pm}_{i_0}},$$

it follows that $\eta^{\pm}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\bar{\theta}}}([0,1])=\hat{\eta}([0,1])$, and

$$p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}\eta^+_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\bar{\theta}}}(x^{-1}(1))+(1-p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}})\eta^-_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\bar{\theta}}}(x^{-1}(1))\le\epsilon+\min_{\tilde{\eta}\in\mathcal{B}([0,1])}\left\{\tilde{\eta}(\mathrm{int}(x^{-1}(1))): W_1(\tilde{\eta},\hat{\eta})\le\bar{\bar{\theta}}\right\},\tag{64}$$

and

$$p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}W_1(\eta^+_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\bar{\theta}}},\hat{\eta})+(1-p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}})W_1(\eta^-_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\bar{\theta}}},\hat{\eta})\le\bar{\bar{\theta}}.\tag{65}$$

Define $\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\eta}}$ and $\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\eta}}(C):=\int_0^\infty\big[&p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}\mathbb{1}\{W_1(\eta^+_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}},\hat{\eta})\in C\}\\&+(1-p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}})\mathbb{1}\{W_1(\eta^-_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}},\hat{\eta})\in C\}\big]\rho_{\hat{\eta}}(d\bar{\bar{\theta}}),\ \forall\text{ Borel set }C\subset[0,\infty),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}(A):=\int_0^\infty\int_\Xi\Big[&p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}\mathbb{1}\big\{\eta^+_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}\in A,\ W_1(\eta^+_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}},\hat{\eta})=\bar{\theta}\big\}\\&+(1-p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}})\mathbb{1}\big\{\eta^-_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}\in A,\ W_1(\eta^-_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}},\hat{\eta})=\bar{\theta}\big\}\Big]\rho_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}(d\eta)\rho_{\hat{\eta}}(d\bar{\bar{\theta}}),\ \forall\text{ Borel set }A\subset\Xi.\end{aligned}$$

We verify that $(\{\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\eta}}\}_{\hat{\eta}},\{\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}\}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}})$ is a feasible solution to the left-hand side of (63). By condition (39), we have $d(\eta^{\pm}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}},\hat{\eta})=W_1(\eta^{\pm}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}},\hat{\eta})$, hence (65) implies that $p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}d(\eta^+_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\bar{\theta}}},\hat{\eta})+(1-p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}})d(\eta^-_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\bar{\theta}}},\hat{\eta})\le\bar{\bar{\theta}}$. Then taking expectation on both sides,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\big[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\eta}}}[\bar{\theta}]\big]=\int_\Xi\int_0^\infty\Big[p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}d(\eta^+_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\bar{\theta}}},\hat{\eta})+(1-p_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}})d(\eta^-_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\bar{\theta}}},\hat{\eta})\Big]\rho_{\hat{\eta}}(d\bar{\bar{\theta}})\nu(d\hat{\eta})=\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\big[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}}[\bar{\theta}]\big]\le\theta,$$

hence $\{\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\eta}}\}_{\hat{\eta}}$ is feasible. Similarly, taking expectation on both sides of (64), we have that $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\Big[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\eta}}}\big[\mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\bar{\gamma}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))]\big]\Big]\le\epsilon+\mathbb{E}_\rho[\tilde{\eta}(x^{-1}(1))]$. Let $\epsilon\to 0$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}&\inf_{\{\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}\}_{\hat{\eta}}}\left\{\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}}\left[\inf_{\{\gamma_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}\}_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}}\mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta},\bar{\theta}}}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))]\right]\right]:\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\eta}\sim\nu}\big[\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\theta}\sim\gamma_{\hat{\eta}}}[\bar{\theta}]\big]\le\theta\right\}\\&\le\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}([0,1])\times\Xi)}\left\{\mathbb{E}_{(\tilde{\eta},\hat{\eta})\sim\rho}[\tilde{\eta}(\mathrm{int}(x^{-1}(1)))]:\ \mathbb{E}_{(\tilde{\eta},\hat{\eta})\sim\rho}\big[W_1(\tilde{\eta},\hat{\eta})\big]\le\theta,\ \pi^2_{\#}\rho=\nu\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

To show the opposite direction, observe that $\inf_{\mu_{\hat\eta,\bar\theta}} \mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\mu_{\hat\eta,\bar\theta}}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))] = \inf_{\eta\in\Xi}\{\eta(x^{-1}(1)) : d(\eta,\hat\eta) = \bar\theta\}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}&\inf_{\{\gamma_{\hat\eta}\}_{\hat\eta}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\hat\eta\sim\nu}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\bar\theta\sim\gamma_{\hat\eta}}\left[\inf_{\{\gamma_{\hat\eta,\bar\theta}\}_{\hat\eta,\bar\theta}} \mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\gamma_{\hat\eta,\bar\theta}}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))] \right] \right] : \mathbb{E}_{\hat\eta\sim\nu}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\bar\theta\sim\gamma_{\hat\eta}}[\bar\theta]\right] \le \theta \right\} \\ &= \inf_{\{\gamma_{\hat\eta}\}_{\hat\eta}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\hat\eta\sim\nu}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\bar\theta\sim\gamma_{\hat\eta}}\left[\inf_{\eta\in\Xi}\left\{\eta(x^{-1}(1)) : d(\eta,\hat\eta) = \bar\theta\right\}\right]\right] : \mathbb{E}_{\hat\eta\sim\nu}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\bar\theta\sim\gamma_{\hat\eta}}[\bar\theta]\right] \le \theta \right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

Let $(\{\gamma_{\hat\eta}\}_{\hat\eta}, \{\eta_{\hat\eta,\bar\theta}\}_{\hat\eta,\bar\theta}\})$ be a feasible solution of the right-hand side of (66). Then the joint distribution $\bar\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}([0,1]) \times \Xi)$ defined by

$$\bar\rho(B) \;:=\; \int_{\pi^2(B)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}\{\eta_{\hat\eta,\bar\theta} \in \pi^1(B)\}\gamma_{\hat\eta}(d\bar\theta)\nu(d\hat\eta),\ \forall \text{ Borel set } B \subset \mathcal{B}([0,1]) \times \Xi$$

is a feasible solution of the right-hand side of (63). By condition (40), we have that

$$\inf_{\eta\in\Xi}\{\eta(x^{-1}(1)) \,:\, d(\eta,\hat\eta) = \bar\theta\} \;\;\ge\;\; \inf_{\tilde\eta\in\mathcal{B}([0,1])} \left\{\tilde\eta(\mathrm{int}(x^{-1}(1))) \,:\, W_1(\tilde\eta,\hat\eta) \le \bar\theta\right\},$$

and thus $\mathbb{E}_{\hat\eta\sim\nu}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\bar\theta\sim\gamma_{\hat\eta}}\left[\inf_\eta\left\{\eta(x^{-1}(1)) : d(\eta,\hat\eta) = \bar\theta\right\}\right]\right] \ge \mathbb{E}_{(\tilde\eta,\hat\eta)\sim\rho}[\tilde\eta(\mathrm{int}(x^{-1}(1)))]$. Therefore we prove the opposite direction and (63) holds. Together with (62), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}&\inf_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\mu}[\eta(x^{-1}(1))] \\ &= \inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}([0,1])\times\Xi)} \left\{\mathbb{E}_{(\tilde\eta,\hat\eta)\sim\rho}[\tilde\eta(\mathrm{int}(x^{-1}(1)))] :\; \mathbb{E}_{(\tilde\eta,\hat\eta)\sim\rho}\left[W_1(\tilde\eta,\hat\eta)\right] \le \theta,\; \pi^2_\#\rho = \nu\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

It then follows that it suffices to only consider policy x such that $x^{-1}(1)$ is an open set. Then by strong duality (Theorem 1), the problem $\min_{\tilde\eta\in\mathcal{B}([0,1])}\left\{\tilde\eta(x^{-1}(1)) : W_1(\tilde\eta,\hat\eta) \le \bar\theta\right\}$ admits a worst-case distribution $\eta_{\hat\eta,\bar\theta}$ and let $\lambda_{\hat\eta,\bar\theta}$ be the associated dual optimizer. Recall $\hat X = \{\hat\xi_t^i : i = 1,\dots,N, t = 1,\dots,m_i\}$. We claim that it suffices to further restrict attention to those policies x such that each connected component of $x^{-1}(1)$ contains at least one point in $\hat X$. Indeed, suppose there exists a connected component C_0 of $x^{-1}(1)$ such that $C_0 \cap \hat X = \varnothing$. Then for every $\zeta \in \mathrm{supp}\ \hat\eta$, recall that $T^\pm(\lambda_{\hat\eta,\bar\theta},\zeta) = \min_{\xi\in[0,1]}\left[\mathbb{1}_{x^{-1}(1)}(\xi) + |\xi-\zeta|\right]$, so $T^\pm(\lambda_{\hat\eta,\bar\theta},\zeta) \notin C_0$, and thus $\eta_{\hat\eta,\bar\theta}(x^{-1}(1)) = \eta_{\hat\eta,\bar\theta}(x^{-1}(1)\setminus C_0)$. Hence, in view of (41), $x' := \mathbb{1}_{\{x^{-1}(1)\setminus C_0\}}$ achieves a higher objective value $v(x')$ than $v(x)$ and thus x cannot be optimal. We finally conclude that there exists $\{\underline{x}_j, \overline{x}_j\}_{j=1}^M$, where $M \le \mathrm{card}(\hat X)$, such that

$$v(x) = -c\sum_{j=1}^M (\overline{x}_j - \underline{x}_j) + \inf_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{E}_{\eta\sim\mu}\left[\eta\{\cup_{j=1}^M[\underline{x}_j,\overline{x}_j]\}\right].$$

□

Proof of Proposition 6. Using Corollary 2 and Lemma 5, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}v\Big(\sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{1}_{[\underline{x}_j,\overline{x}_j]}\Big) = \min_{\substack{0\le p^i\le 1,\\ \eta^i,\tilde\eta^i\in\Xi}} \Bigg\{ &\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{j=1}^M \Big[-c(\overline{x}_j - \underline{x}_j) + p^i\eta^i\{[\underline{x}_j,\overline{x}_j]\} + (1-p^i)\tilde\eta^i\{[\underline{x}_j,\overline{x}_j]\}\Big] : \\ &\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left[p^i W_1(\eta^i,\hat\eta^i) + (1-p^i)W_1(\tilde\eta^i,\hat\eta^i)\right] \le \theta\Bigg\}.\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

By definition of Wasserstein distance, for $\eta^i = \sum_{i=1}^{m_i} \delta_{\xi_t^i}$, we have that $W_1(\eta^i, \hat{\eta}^i) = \min_\sigma \sum_{t=1}^{m_i} |\xi_t^i - \widehat{\xi}_{\sigma(t)}^i|$, where the minimum is taken over all m_i-permutations. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
& v\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{M} \mathbb{1}_{[\underline{x}_j, \overline{x}_j]}\Big) - \sum_{j=1}^{M} -c(\overline{x}_j - \underline{x}_j) \\
= & \min_{\substack{\xi_t^i, \tilde{\xi}_t^i \in [0,1], \\ 0 \le p^i \le 1}} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Big[p^i \sum_{t=1}^{m_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \mathbb{1}_{[\underline{x}_j, \overline{x}_j]}(\xi_t) + (1-p^i) \sum_{t=1}^{m_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \mathbb{1}_{[\underline{x}_j, \overline{x}_j]}(\tilde{\xi}_t) \Big] : \right. \\
& \qquad \left. \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Big[p^i \sum_{t=1}^{m_i} |\xi_t^i - \widehat{\xi}_t^i| + (1-p^i) \sum_{t=1}^{m_i} |\tilde{\xi}_t^i - \widehat{\xi}_t^i| \Big] \le \theta \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{68}
$$

Using Example 6, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& v\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{M} \mathbb{1}_{[\underline{x}_j, \overline{x}_j]}\Big) - \sum_{j=1}^{M} -c(\overline{x}_j - \underline{x}_j) \\
= & \min_{p^i, p_{tj\pm}^i, \tilde{p}_{tj\pm}^i \in [0,1]} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Big(p^i \sum_{t=1}^{m_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M} [\mathbb{1}_{[\underline{x}_j, \overline{x}_j]}(\widehat{\xi}_t^i) - (\underline{p}_{tj}^i + \overline{p}_{tj}^i)] \right. \\
& \qquad \left. + (1-p^i) \sum_{t=1}^{m_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M} [\mathbb{1}_{[\underline{x}_j, \overline{x}_j]}(\widehat{\xi}_t^i) - (\underline{p'}_{tj}^i + \overline{p'}_t^i)] \Big) : \right. \\
& \qquad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Big(p^i \sum_{t=1}^{m_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \big[\underline{p}_{tj}^i |\underline{x}_j - \widehat{\xi}_t^i| + \overline{p}_{tj}^i |\overline{x}_j - \widehat{\xi}_t^i| \big] \\
& \qquad\qquad + (1-p^i) \sum_{t=1}^{m_i} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \big[\underline{p'}_{tj}^i |\underline{x}_j - \widehat{\xi}_t^i| + \overline{p'}_t^i |\overline{x}_j - \widehat{\xi}_t^i| \big] \Big) \le \theta, \\
& \qquad\qquad \left. \sum_{j=1}^{M} \big(\underline{p}_{tj}^i + \overline{p}_{tj}^i \big) \le 1, \sum_{j=1}^{M} \big(\underline{p'}_{tj}^i + \overline{p'}_{tj}^i \big) \le 1, \forall i, t \right\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Replacing $p^i \overline{p}_{tj}^i + (1-p^i) \overline{p'}_{tj}^i$ by $\overline{p}_{tj}^i$, and $p^i \underline{p}_{tj}^i + (1-p^i) \underline{p'}_{tj}^i$ by $\underline{p}_{tj}^i$, noticing that at optimality, $\overline{p}_{tj}^i, \underline{p}_{tj}^i > 0$ only if $\widehat{\xi}_t^i \in [x_{j_-}, \overline{x}_j]$, and at most one of $\{\overline{p}_{tj}^i, \underline{p}_{tj}^i\}_{i,t,j}$ can be fractional, we obtain the result. □

Proof of Proposition 7. Define $C_w := \{\xi : -w^\top \xi < q\}$ for all w. Similar to Example 7 and Theorem 1(ii), there exists a worst-case distribution μ^* which attains the infimum $\inf_{\mu \in \mathfrak{M}} \mathbb{P}_\mu\{-w^\top \xi < q\}$ and there exists maps $\underline{T}^*, \overline{T}^*$ such that for each $\zeta \in \operatorname{supp} \nu$, it holds that $\underline{T}^*(\zeta), \overline{T}^*(\zeta) \in \{\zeta, \arg\min_{\xi \in \Xi \setminus C_w} d(\xi, \zeta)\}$. With this in mind, let γ^* be the optimal transport plan between ν and μ^*, and let

$$
t^* := \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\zeta \in \operatorname{supp} \nu} \left\{ \min_{\xi \in \Xi \setminus C_w} d(\xi, \zeta) : \ \zeta \neq \underline{T}^*(\zeta) \right\}.
$$

So t^* is the longest distance of transportation among all the points that are transported. (We note that infinity is allowed in the definition of t^*, however, as will be shown, this violates the probability bound.) Then μ^* transports all the points in $\operatorname{supp} \nu \cap \{\xi : q - t^* < -w^\top \xi < b\}$, and possibly a fraction of mass $\beta^* \in [0,1]$ in $\operatorname{supp} \nu \cap \{\xi : -w^\top \xi = q - t^*\}$. Also note that by Hölder's inequality, the d-distance between two hyperplanes $\{\xi : -w^\top \xi = s\}$ and $\{\xi : -w^\top \xi = s'\}$ equals to $|s - s'|/||x||_1 = |s - s'|$. Using this characterization, let us define a probability measure ν_w on $\mathbb{R}$ for any w by

$$
\nu_w\{(-\infty, s)\} := \nu\{\xi : -w^\top \xi < s\}, \ \forall s \in \mathbb{R},
$$

then using the changing of measure, the total distance of transportation can be computed by

$$\int_{(\Xi\setminus C_w)\times C_w} d^p(\xi,\zeta)\gamma^*(d\xi,d\zeta) = \int_{(q-t^*)+}^{q-} (q-s)^p \nu_w(ds) + \beta^* \nu_w(\{q-t^*\}) t^{*p} \le \theta^p. \tag{69}$$

On the other hand, using property of marginal expectation and the characterization of γ^*,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^*(C_w) &= \int_{C_w\times\Xi} \gamma^*(d\xi,d\zeta) \\
&= \nu(C_w) - \int_{(\Xi\setminus C_w)\times C_w} \gamma^*(d\xi,d\zeta) \\
&= 1 - \nu_w([q,\infty)) - \beta^*\nu_w(\{q-t^*\}) + \nu_w\{(q-t^*,q)\} \\
&= 1 - \nu_w(q-t^*,\infty) - \beta^*\nu_w(\{q-t^*\}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thereby the condition $\inf_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}} \mu(C_w) \ge 1-\alpha$ is equivalent to

$$\beta^*\nu_w(\{q-t^*\}) + \nu_w(q-t^*,\infty) \le \alpha. \tag{70}$$

Now consider the quantity

$$J := \int_{(\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi])+}^{q-} (q-s)^p \nu_w(ds) + \beta_0 \nu_w\big(\{\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi]\}\big)(q-\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi])^p - \theta^p.$$

If $J<0$, due to the monotonicity in t^* of the right-hand side of (69), either $q-t^* < \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi]$ or $q-t^* = \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi]$ and $\beta^* > \beta_0$. But in both cases (70) is violated. On the other hand if $J\ge 0$, again by monotonicity, either $q-t^* > \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi]$, or $q-t^* > \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha[-w^\top\xi]$ and $\beta^* \le \beta_0^*$ and thus (70) is satisfied. □

Proof of Corollary 3. Set $u=(u_1,\ldots,u_N)$ and $\mathcal{U} = \left\{u : \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N ||u_i||^p \le \theta^p\right\}$. Observe that x is feasible if and only if

$$\begin{aligned}
t &\ge \max_{u\in\mathcal{U}} \left\{ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N (a_i[u]^\top x + b_i[u]) : \begin{pmatrix} a_i[u] \\ b_i[u] \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{a}_i \\ \hat{b}_i \end{pmatrix} + u_i \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{a}_i^\top x + \hat{b}_i) + \frac{1}{N}\max_{u\in\mathcal{U}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^\top x \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

Then by Hölder's inequality it follows that

$$\frac{1}{N}\max_{u\in\mathcal{U}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N u_i^\top x \right\} \le \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N ||u_i||_q ||x||_{q^*} \le \theta ||x||_{q^*},$$

where $1/q + 1/q^* = 1$, and equality holds at, for example, $u_i = \theta y$, $i=1,\ldots,N$, where y satisfies $y^\top x = ||x||_{q^*}$. Hence x is feasible if and only if

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{a}_i[u]^\top x + \hat{b}_i[u]) + \theta||x||_{q^*} \le t.$$

□

Proposition 9. *The two-stage linear DRSO (50) is strongly NP-hard.*

Proof of Proposition 9. Let $N=1$, $\nu=\delta_{\widehat{\xi}}$, and $\alpha_l>\beta_l>0$, $l=1,\ldots,s$ be given constants. Consider a special case of problem (50) as follows.

$$\min_{x\in X} c^\top x+\sup_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}}\mathbb{E}_\mu\left[\min_{y_l^\pm\geq 0}\left\{\sum_{l=1}^s \alpha_l y_l^+-\beta_l y_l^-:\ y_l^++y_l^-=\xi_l-x_l,\forall l\right\}\right]. \tag{71}$$

Note that

$$\sup_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}}\mathbb{E}_\mu\left[\min_{y_l^\pm\geq 0}\left\{\sum_{l=1}^s \alpha_l y_l^+-\beta_l y_l^-:\ y_l^++y_l^-=\xi_l-x_l,\forall l\right\}\right]=\sup_{\mu\in\mathfrak{M}}\mathbb{E}_\mu\left[\sum_{l=1}^s[\alpha_l(\xi_l-x_l)^+-\beta_l(x_l-\xi_l)^+]\right].$$

Recall the definition (11) of Φ, we have for any $\lambda>0$, the right-hand side of

$$\Phi(\lambda,\widehat{\xi})=\inf_{\xi\in\Xi}\left\{\lambda||\xi-\widehat{\xi}||_2^2-\sum_{l=1}^s[\alpha_l(\xi_l-x_l)^+-\beta_l(x_l-\xi_l)^+]\right\}$$

has a unique solution. When $\lambda=0$, $\Phi(0,\widehat{\xi})$ is $-\infty$. Hence by Theorem 1(iii), problem (71) is equivalent to

$$\min_{x\in X} c^\top x+\sup_{\xi:||\xi-\widehat{\xi}||_2\leq\theta}\mathbb{E}_\mu\left[\min_{y_l^\pm\geq 0}\left\{\sum_{l=1}^s \alpha_l y_l^+-\beta_l y_l^-:\ y_l^++y_l^-=\xi_l-x_l\right\}\right]. \tag{72}$$

It has been shown in Minoux [35] that problem (72) is strongly NP-hard. As a consequence, the two-stage linear DRSO (50) is strongly NP-hard even when only the right-hand side vector $h(\xi)$ is uncertain. □

Appendix B: Selecting radius θ We mainly use a classical result on Wasserstein distance from Bolley et al. [12]. Let ν_N be the empirical distribution of ξ obtained from the underlying distribution ν_0. In Theorem 1.1 (see also Remark 1.4) of Bolley et al. [12], it is shown that $\mathbb{P}\{W_1(\nu_N,\nu_0)>\theta\}\leq C(\theta)e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}N\theta^2}$ for some constant λ dependent on ν_0, and C dependent on θ. Since their result holds for general distributions, we here simplify it for our purpose and explicitly compute the constants λ and C. For a more detailed analysis, we refer the reader to Section 2.1 in Bolley et al. [12].

Noticing that by assumption supp $\nu_0\subset[0,\bar{B}]$, the truncation step in Bolley et al. [12] is no longer needed, thus the probability bound (2.12) (see also (2.15)) of Bolley et al. [12] is reduced to

$$\mathbb{P}\{W_1(\nu_N,\nu_0)>\theta\}\leq\max\left(8e\frac{\bar{B}}{\delta},1\right)^{\mathcal{N}(\frac{\delta}{2})}e^{-\frac{\lambda}{8}N(\theta-\delta)^2}$$

for some constant $\lambda>0$, $\delta\in(0,\theta)$, where e is the natural logarithm, and $\mathcal{N}(\frac{\delta}{2})$ is the minimal number of balls need to cover the support of ξ by balls of radius $\delta/2$ and in our case, $\mathcal{N}(\frac{\delta}{2})=\bar{B}/\delta$. Now let us compute λ. By Theorem 1.1 of Bolley et al. [12], λ is the constant appeared in the Talagrand inequality

$$W_1(\mu,\nu_0)\leq\sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda}I_{\phi_{kl}}(\mu,\nu_0)},$$

where the Kullback-Leibler divergence of μ with respect to ν is defined by $I_{\phi_{kl}}(\mu,\nu_0)=+\infty$ if μ is not absolutely continuous with respect to ν_0, otherwise $I_{\phi_{kl}}(\mu,\nu_0)=\int f\log f d\nu_0$, where f is the Radon-Nikodym derivative $d\mu/d\nu_0$. Corollary 4 in Bolley and Villani [13] shows that λ can be chosen as

$$\lambda=\left[\inf_{\zeta_0\in\Xi,\alpha>0}\frac{1}{\alpha}\left(1+\log\int e^{\alpha d^2(\xi,\zeta_0)}\nu(d\xi)\right)\right]^{-1},$$

which can be estimated from data. Finally, we obtain a concentration inequality

$$\mathbb{P}\{W_1(\nu_N, \nu_0) > \theta\} \quad \leq \quad \max\left(8e\frac{\bar{B}}{\delta}, 1\right)^{\frac{\bar{B}}{\delta}} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{8}N(\theta-\delta)^2}. \tag{73}$$

In the numerical experiment, we choose δ to make the right-hand side of (73) as small as possible, and θ is chosen such that the right-hand side of (73) is equal to 0.05.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank Wilfrid Gangbo, David Goldberg, Alex Shapiro, and Weijun Xie for several stimulating discussions, and Yuan Li for providing the image (Figure (1b)).

References

[1] Ambrosio L, Fusco N, Pallara D (2000) *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems*, volume 254 (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

[2] Ambrosio L, Gigli N, Savaré G (2008) *Gradient flows: in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures* (Springer Science & Business Media).

[3] Aubin JP, Frankowska H (2009) *Set-valued analysis* (Springer Science & Business Media).

[4] Barbour AD, Brown TC (1992) Stein's method and point process approximation. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 43(1):9–31.

[5] Bartholdi JJ, Platzman LK (1988) Heuristics based on spacefilling curves for combinatorial problems in euclidean space. *Management Science* 34(3):291–305.

[6] Bayraksan G, Love DK (2015) Data-driven stochastic programming using phi-divergences. *Tutorials in Operations Research* .

[7] Beardwood J, Halton JH, Hammersley JM (1959) The shortest path through many points. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 55, 299–327 (Cambridge Univ Press).

[8] Ben-Tal A, Den Hertog D, De Waegenaere A, Melenberg B, Rennen G (2013) Robust solutions of optimization problems affected by uncertain probabilities. *Management Science* 59(2):341–357.

[9] Ben-Tal A, Goryashko A, Guslitzer E, Nemirovski A (2004) Adjustable robust solutions of uncertain linear programs. *Mathematical Programming* 99(2):351–376.

[10] Berger JO (1984) The robust bayesian viewpoint. *Studies in Bayesian Econometrics and Statistics : In Honor of Leonard J. Savage., Edited by Joseph B. Kadane* 4(2):63–124.

[11] Blanchet J, Murthy K (2016) Quantifying distributional model risk via optimal transport. *Working paper* .

[12] Bolley F, Guillin A, Villani C (2007) Quantitative concentration inequalities for empirical measures on non-compact spaces. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 137(3-4):541–593.

[13] Bolley F, Villani C (2005) Weighted csiszár-kullback-pinsker inequalities and applications to transportation inequalities. *Annales de la Faculté des sciences de Toulouse: Mathématiques*, volume 14, 331–352.

[14] Boyd S, Vandenberghe L (2004) *Convex optimization* (Cambridge university press).

[15] Calafiore GC, El Ghaoui L (2006) On distributionally robust chance-constrained linear programs. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 130(1):1–22.

[16] Carlsson JG, Behroozi M, Mihic K (2015) Wasserstein distance and the distributionally robust TSP. *submitted to Operations Reserach* .

[17] Chen LH, Xia A (2004) Stein's method, palm theory and poisson process approximation. *Annals of Probability* 2545–2569.

[18] Delage E, Ye Y (2010) Distributionally robust optimization under moment uncertainty with application to data-driven problems. *Operations Research* 58(3):595–612.

[19] Dupačová J (1987) The minimax approach to stochastic programming and an illustrative application. *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes* 20(1):73–88.

[20] El Ghaoui L, Oks M, Oustry F (2003) Worst-case value-at-risk and robust portfolio optimization: A conic programming approach. *Operations Research* 51(4):543–556.

[21] Erdoğan E, Iyengar G (2006) Ambiguous chance-constrained problems and robust optimization. *Mathematical Programming* 107(1-2):37–61.

[22] Esfahani PM, Kuhn D (2015) Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the Wasserstein metric: performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.05116* .

[23] Fournier N, Guillin A (2014) On the rate of convergence in Wasserstein distance of the empirical measure. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 1–32.

[24] Gallego G, Moon I (1993) The distribution free newsboy problem: review and extensions. *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 825–834.

[25] Gibbs AL, Su FE (2002) On choosing and bounding probability metrics. *International statistical review* 70(3):419–435.

[26] Goh J, Sim M (2010) Distributionally robust optimization and its tractable approximations. *Operations Research* 58(4-part-1):902–917.

[27] Gonzalez RC, Woods RE (2006) *Digital Image Processing (3rd Edition)* (Prentice-Hall, Inc.).

[28] Haimovich M, Rinnooy Kan A (1985) Bounds and heuristics for capacitated routing problems. *Mathematics of operations Research* 10(4):527–542.

[29] Himmelberg C (1975) Measurable relations. *Fundamenta mathematicae* 87:53–72.

[30] Hwang FK, Richards DS (1992) Steiner tree problems. *Networks* 22(1):55–89.

[31] Jiang R, Guan Y (2015) Data-driven chance constrained stochastic program. *Mathematical Programming* 1–37.

[32] Kantorovich LV (1942) On the translocation of masses. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, volume 37, 199–201.

[33] Kantorovich LV (1960) Mathematical methods of organizing and planning production. *Management Science* 6(4):366–422.

[34] Ling H, Okada K (2007) An efficient earth mover's distance algorithm for robust histogram comparison. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on* 29(5):840–853.

[35] Minoux M (2012) Two-stage robust lp with ellipsoidal right-hand side uncertainty is np-hard. *Optimization Letters* 6(7):1463–1475.

[36] Munkres J (2000) Topology .

[37] Nemirovski A (2004) Prox-method with rate of convergence O(1/t) for variational inequalities with lipschitz continuous monotone operators and smooth convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 15(1):229–251.

[38] Nesterov Y, Nemirovski A (2013) On first-order algorithms for l 1/nuclear norm minimization. *Acta Numerica* 22:509–575.

[39] Pardo L (2005) *Statistical inference based on divergence measures* (CRC Press).

[40] Parikh N, Boyd SP (2014) Proximal algorithms. *Foundations and Trends in Optimization* 1(3):127–239.

[41] Pflug GC, Pichler A (2014) *Multistage stochastic optimization* (Springer).

[42] Platzman LK, Bartholdi JJ (1989) Spacefilling curves and the planar travelling salesman problem. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 36(4):719–737.

[43] Popescu I (2007) Robust mean-covariance solutions for stochastic optimization. *Operations Research* 55(1):98–112.

[44] Rockafellar RT, Wets RJB (2009) *Variational analysis*, volume 317 (Springer Science & Business Media).

[45] Rubner Y, Tomasi C, Guibas LJ (2000) The earth mover's distance as a metric for image retrieval. *International Journal of Computer Vision* 40(2):99–121.

[46] Scarf H, Arrow K, Karlin S (1958) A min-max solution of an inventory problem. *Studies in the Mathematical Theory of Inventory and Production* 10:201–209.

[47] Shapiro A, Dentcheva D, et al. (2014) *Lectures on stochastic programming: modeling and theory*, volume 16 (SIAM).

[48] Shapiro A, Kleywegt A (2002) Minimax analysis of stochastic problems. *Optimization Methods and Software* 17(3):523–542.

[49] Steele JM (1981) Subadditive euclidean functionals and nonlinear growth in geometric probability. *The Annals of Probability* 365–376.

[50] Steele JM (1997) *Probability theory and combinatorial optimization*, volume 69 (SIAM).

[51] Sun H, Xu H (2015) Convergence analysis for distributionally robust optimization and equilibrium problems. *Mathematics of Operations Research* .

[52] Villani C (2003) *Topics in optimal transportation*. Number 58 (American Mathematical Soc.).

[53] Villani C (2008) *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338 (Springer Science & Business Media).

[54] Wagner DH (1977) Survey of measurable selection theorems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 15(5):859–903.

[55] Wang Z, Glynn PW, Ye Y (2015) Likelihood robust optimization for data-driven problems. *Computational Management Science* 1–21.

[56] Žáčková J (1966) On minimax solutions of stochastic linear programming problems. *Časopis pro pěstování matematiky* 91(4):423–430.

[57] Zhao C, Guan Y (2015) Data-driven risk-averse stochastic optimization with Wasserstein metric. *Available on Optimization Online* .

[58] Zymler S, Kuhn D, Rustem B (2013) Distributionally robust joint chance constraints with second-order moment information. *Mathematical Programming* 137(1-2):167–198.